

THE
CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. X.—MARCH, 1870.—No. 52.

ARTICLE I.

THE FREE-THINKERS AND THE FREE SCHOOLS.

THE common school system of national education is one of the oldest, and most popular, of our republican institutions. It was intended and adapted to include the principles of religion, and the precepts of morals, as well as the attainments of literature, as indispensable to the qualifications of our children for good citizenship. The general belief of the necessity of a moral and religious education of the people is distinctly stated in the ordinance of 1787, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly (of the Northwest Territory) to pass suitable laws to protect every denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of worship, and to encourage schools, and the means of instruction." The nation being Christian and Protestant, the religion and morality of our schools are those of Protestant Christianity. While no denominational tenets are taught, the Bible, as the common basis of Christian faith, is read, and the morality taught in the schools is based upon its precepts; and the history, poli-

tical economy, and philosophy, assume the positions of evangelical religion.

In the process of immigration, a large number of persons of different styles of religion have obtained citizenship among us; among whom are Papists from Ireland, and Rationalists and Atheists from Germany. Both these classes perceive that our Common Schools are hostile to their peculiar tenets; and they have raised an agitation to revolutionize the system so as to render it conducive to their own sectarian views, or at least less hostile to them; or failing of either of those objects, to overturn it altogether.

It must not be supposed, however, that a majority either of the Irish or of the Germans are hostile to our school system. On the contrary, if the priests would only let them alone, our Irish citizens would gladly avail themselves of the common school education for their children. As it is, even when compelled to withdraw them, after a few weeks' attendance upon the ecclesiastical schools, the inferiority of the latter is so manifest that the children frequently contrive to elude even priestly vigilance, and to steal back to the common schools. The opposition to the schools comes from the priests rather than from the Irish people. So, also, the great majority of the Germans are honest, peaceable persons, who never would trouble themselves to disturb the schools, and in fact do not. They are settled all over the country, mostly in agricultural regions, and generally are professors of some form of Christianity, either Lutheran or Catholic. Let it be distinctly understood that the conspiracy against religion which this essay will unveil has not been hatched by the German people, the majority of whom are utterly ignorant of it, but by a comparatively small faction of atheists, confined to the large cities, where they are furnished by the theatres, gambling houses and saloons, and by the plunder of the public treasury. It is wholly a civic question. The people of the agricultural regions have never discussed it. It is only in a few large

cities, such as New York, Boston, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Chicago, where thousands of the demoralized mechanics of European cities are crowded together, that the more fanatical atheists can find a crowd ignorant and ungodly enough to follow their leading. This class they control by the daily German papers, which are all edited in the anti-christian interest, and by appeals to their national prejudices. By judicious political manœvering they can control the city elections, but as yet they have not a majority of votes in any State election. To obtain this they must convert the American people. The agitation has, however, spread among the American communities of our large cities, many of whom seem terrified by the threats of Father Hecker, that the Papists will soon be our masters, and disposed to favor some change of our system which shall meet them half way, and conciliate their good will. The Papists demand a division of the school funds to each denomination, in proportion to the number of children. In Chicago this would give them very nearly half the schools; in New York this has been conceded them, and it is likely to be conceded in several western cities. To avert this national establishment of Popery, others propose to do away with the whole system of national education, and to leave the support and direction of the schools to parents; that schools, like churches, should depend wholly on voluntary contributions. Others, regarding this as a great evil, propose as a compromise measure, to free the schools from the objectionable and divisive element of religion, by excluding the Bible, and all religious instruction of any kind. This plan has been adopted by the Board of Education of Cincinnati; but their action being impugned as illegal, it is now on trial before the Supreme Court.

It is evident that a proper consideration of either of these projects involves a review of the others, and that none of them can be discussed intelligently without a consideration of the fundamental principles of national education, and national religion. This is especially inevitable in

any discussion of the question of expelling the Bible and all religious instruction from our public schools, a proposal utterly revolutionary in its character, although advocated as congenial to our American principle of religious liberty, and of the equal rights of all religions.

The nature of the demand made upon us must be distinctly understood. It is not merely the Bible, but "all religious instruction" which is to be excluded from our schools. Such is the imperative order of the Cincinnati Board. It is not merely the book which offends these men, it is the religion it teaches. The argument on which they chiefly rely is, that this book teaches religion, and religion is offensive to many of our more enlightened citizens. Our German newspapers dwell on this feature with great emphasis, that their children are compelled to imbibe the superstition of belief in a God, and that they are taught to degrade themselves by worshiping some being supposed to be superior to the human soul. They cannot find words expressive enough to declare their disgust with such an imposition on their consciences. They are disgusted with the God of the Bible, and with the religion of the Bible, and therefore they demand that the Bible shall be excluded from the schools as grossly offensive to them. They demand the privilege of remodeling our whole constitution of religion, morals, and politics, according to their notions of propriety.

The first question which such a proposal raises is an inquiry into the character of the proposed reformers. Such a mode of inquiry may be objected to as calculated to prejudice the mind, and to prevent an impartial examination of the principles of the case. But there are no unprejudiced people in this world; nor is any such impartiality possible or desirable in the decision of a case between Christ and Belial. The man who would allege his perfect impartiality in such a controversy, and his determination to decide his adhesion without any reference to the character of the combatants, purely upon abstract prin-

ciples, would be summarily scouted by both with the curse of Meroz. Our Lord has a hearty hatred of iniquity and its workers, and teaches us not to be deluded by empty declamations about abstract rights, which never had any existence, but to use our common sense, behold principles in practice, and try men's theories by their conduct: "By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" The tree will bear fruit like last year's crop. In every business negotiation the character of the parties is the first and best half of the business; and this is a practical business matter, depending wholly upon the moral character of the persons we entrust with the morals of our children. If they are persons of bad character, if they shamelessly avow their contempt for the first principles of religion and morality, could we be cajoled by any sophistry to commit to them the education of our children? All men of common sense will defer the investigation of the principles of the new harmony until they have inquired into the antecedents of its projectors. How have they succeeded in the regeneration of their own hearts and houses? Have the physicians healed themselves? Have they succeeded by the application of their great principle of the supremacy of the human soul in producing such peaceful households as to encourage us to trust them with an experiment of its power in the larger family of the state? Do their mistresses live in harmony. Are their children respectful, and well behaved, and honest? Have the frequenters of their saloons and billiard tables become model workmen? Would we wish the whole community educated under such influences? Manifestly, failure in the past, on the small scale, would not encourage our confidence in their future success in a grand experiment. Were Barnum to present a plan for the prevention of swindling in Wall Street, or Brigham Young to agitate a revision of the marriage laws, or Jefferson Davis to discuss the re-organization of the army of the United States, most people would feel warranted to decline any discussion of

principles thus inauspiciously heralded. How comes it to pass then, that the cry of bigotry and prejudice is raised when a demand being made upon us for the keys of our constitution by its avowed enemies, we propose a previous investigation of the character of the burglars?

The present opposition to the Bible in the public schools of Cincinnati combines two classes of persons of the most opposite sentiments on other subjects; so discordant, indeed, that their continued co-operation on this matter would be miraculous. Papists and infidels. On this very subject of education, moreover, they are in the most direct contrariety to each other; the Papists demanding the entire control of education for the church, viz.: their clergy; the infidels demanding the utter excommunication of all religion of every kind from the schools. (See the Papal Syllabus of Errors, Sec. 45, 47, 48.) The union of these deadly enemies to expel the Bible from the schools of Cincinnati is, however, merely accidental, and purely local, a blunder of the local clergy, which will be corrected at headquarters, unless Rome be in her dotage, and which will not be repeated. Rome justly fears Atheism more than Protestantism. The Revolution has been worse for her than ten Reformations. It is not from Rome that the proposal of atheistic education emanates. On the contrary, it is the alleged want of religion in our schools which excites her opposition to them.

The American Popish clergy and newspapers with one voice distinctly repudiate the Cincinnati scheme, and, on the contrary, distinctly demand a division of the school fund. Thus, Rev. Mr. Preston, in a sermon preached in St. Ann's, New York, 12th Dec., 1869, says: "As to the reading of the Bible, we do not consider that of importance. We demand that we shall receive our proportion, in regard to the number of children instructed, of the fund so raised; and the State is bound to recognize this; and that every school private, or public, or denominational, so that it be gratuitous, shall receive from the State its proportion of the

fund raised for education, and no more."—*Presbyterian*, Dec. 15th, 1869.

Bishop Ryan, of Buffalo, also, in his farewell address to his diocese before leaving for the Council, at great length denounces public schools as a great evil, and charges them with promoting infidelity, immorality, and, in short, most of the evils which afflict society.—*The Evangelist*, Dec. 23, 1869.

The leading Popish papers are equally explicit in their denunciations of the whole system of our common schools. *The Tablet*, representing the more intelligent part of the church, distinctly repudiates the Cincinnati plan:

"The School Board of Cincinnati have voted to exclude the Bible and all religious instruction from the public schools of that city. If this has been done with a view to reconcile Catholics to the common school system, its purpose will not be realized. It does not meet nor in any degree lessen our objections to the public school system, and only proves the impracticability of that system, in a mixed community of Catholics and Protestants, for it proves that the schools must, to be sustained, become thoroughly godless. But to us godless schools are still less acceptable than sectarian schools, and we object less to the reading of King James' Bible, even in the schools, than we do to the exclusion of all religious instruction. American Protestantism of the orthodox stamp, is far less evil than German infidelity."

The Freeman's Journal, the organ of the Church militant, with genuine Hibernian frankness, leaves us in no perplexity as to the designs of that party. It says: "The Catholic solution of this muddle about Bible or no Bible in the schools, is 'hands off.' No state taxation or donations for any schools. You look to your children, and we will look to ours. We don't want you to be taxed for Catholic schools. We do not want to be taxed for Protestant or godless schools. Let the public school system go where it came from—the Devil—we want Christian schools, and the State can not tell us what Christianity is." (Cited in the *Evangelist*, 23rd Dec., 1869.

These repeated affirmations certainly should be sufficient to assure us at least of what the Romish clergy want.

They are no party to the demand for the exclusion of the Bible. They would be in no respect conciliated by making our schools atheistic. What they demand is, schools of which they shall have the exclusive control. The highest authority of that sect—the Pope—in his Syllabus of modern deadly evils condemned, Section 48, explicitly condemns the doctrine: “That a method of instructing youth can be approved by Catholic men which is separated from the Catholic faith, and from the power of the Church, and which has regard exclusively, or at least principally, to a knowledge of natural things only, and to the ends of social life on earth.” It is not the Catholics, then, who demand the exclusion of the Bible and of religion from our public schools; nor would they be at all conciliated by any such gratuitous blunder.

The demand for the exclusion of the Bible, and of all religious instruction, from the schools comes not from the Papists, but from Atheists. It is true that they have, by various influences, succeeded in associating with themselves a considerable number of persons of various degrees of belief and unbelief; from the extreme left of the Broad Church, to the liberal Catholic; and they manage to carry the German vote of several large cities by appeals to nationality. These parties do not intend to sanction the ultimate ends of their leaders; have no idea of proceeding to the extremities they contemplate; and most of them are not aware of the ultimate objects of the revolution to which they lend their energies. Such persons, however, cannot give character to the conflict. In all revolutions the fanatics govern, and the timid, conservative, halfway followers must either quicken their pace and keep step with the battalion, or be trodden under foot in the charge of battle. The presence of a number of virtuous, honest, pious men in the antichristian army does not constitute it Christian in its assaults upon the Bible, the flag of our Union; they, on the contrary, must be content to take character from the colleagues with whom they associate, from the leaders

under whom they serve, and from the cause to which they render aid and comfort. The expulsion of the Bible is a part of the assault upon Christian society now in progress under the flag of atheism and materialism.

The proposal for the expulsion of the Bible from the public schools originates with a sect of atheists, formidable in Europe from their fanaticism, and the tremendous destruction of property and life, and the overthrow of the most venerable institutions, which they have perpetrated; though they have never been able to establish any permanent organization, much less any national government. By the progress of immigration, hundreds of thousands of these persons have become citizens of the United States; have settled in large numbers in our large cities, control all the daily German and several influential American newspapers, and to a great extent the politics of the foreign population. These papers openly and daily propagate the grossest materialism; deny any state of rewards or punishments after death; ignore the existence of God, or of any power superior to the human soul, ridicule all religion as superstition, and deny the authority of either God or man over the individual consciousness. They formally protest against the New England Puritan Republic, as based on the ideas of a patriarchal despotism, and of religious dogmas, diametrically opposed to their ideas of liberty. They demand that these new Western States be cast in mold of European republicanism, *i. e.*, that of the French Directory. They demand that the government shall become a mere police of person and property, and shall abnegate all attempts to regulate morals; that all recognition of religion, in any form whatever, be discontinued, as insulting to the human soul; that all laws requiring or permitting the administration of oaths be repealed; that all laws protecting the Sabbath be repealed; that sumptuary legislation — as they are pleased to designate the laws against gambling, drunkenness, and lewdness — be abolished, and every man be allowed to enjoy himself to his heart's content in all such

pleasures; and that all laws regulating or authorizing marriage be repealed, and a simple enactment substituted making the parents responsible for the support of the children. They wish, finally, to abolish the family, and substitute a general association. As an indispensable preliminary movement of this grand subversion of existing society, it is necessary to obtain control of the education of, at least, one generation of voters, who are to be trained up in ignorance of God, and in the belief of the Positive Philosophy. This cannot be accomplished while our common school system of education is based on religion. They accordingly demand the exclusion of all religious instruction, including the Bible, from our schools.

This is no mere isolated outburst of irreligion. It is nothing less than a conspiracy against our Christian society. Of course, in adducing proof of such a serious and alarming assertion, it will be necessary to refer to a considerable number of authorities, of various degrees of respectability; but all trustworthy enough in their declarations of war against God, and against those ordinances by which He comes into communion with men. The army of this rebellion combines and employs its rank and file, its general officers, its artillery, and commissariat; entrenches its batteries in beer gardens and Sunday theatres, and asks votes of supplies from legislatures and parliaments; speaks from the infidel pulpit, in the scientific lecture, or on the political platform; and subsidizes the newspaper press, and the authors of systems of philosophy, and political economy; — but all co-operate in assailing marriage, the Sabbath, the Bible, and the laws. Amidst the greatest possible variety of style, ranging from the grave reasonings of the erudite philosopher down to the ribald blasphemies of the German daily paper, we discover unmistakably the uniting principle of bitter, envenomed enmity against the authority of Almighty God, and against any authority claiming jurisdiction over the soul of man. The fundamental objection

to the Bible is, that it is an assertion of such authority over the human soul.

But, indeed, we have no need to unearth concealed facts to prove the charge of a determined conspiracy against all religion; it is openly avowed, and gloried in, by the assailants of the Bible in the schools. Nothing can be more willfully silly than for any man who reads the newspapers to suppose that the opposition to the Bible is merely a conscientious dislike to some of the lesser peculiarities of revealed religion, while its opponents hold equally with the American people the general principles of religion and morality which it inculcates, and which we have embodied in our common law, and christian civilization. It is a war against the God of the Bible, a war against the morals of the Bible, a war against the sanctions of the Bible, and indeed a war against religion of any kind in the schools. The resolutions passed by the Cincinnati Board of Education are perfectly explicit on that subject:—“*Resolved*: That religious instruction, and the reading of religious books, including the Holy Bible, are prohibited in the common schools of Cincinnati,” etc. It is not merely the reading of the Bible, but “religious instruction” also which is *prohibited*, that is the word, well chosen to express the design of the enemies of religion. They act on system.

Indeed, they take pains to explain to us the process by which, when they have obtained the control of the schools, they mean to use them for the propagation and defense of atheism, by expelling all books and teachers adverse to their views. Lecky, in his *History of Rationalism*, (ii. 95,) gives us the philosophy of national education, and applies it practically to these measures: “The overwhelming majority of the human race necessarily accept their opinions from authority. Whether they do so avowedly, like the Catholics, or unconsciously, like most Protestants, is immaterial. They have neither time nor opportunity to examine for themselves. They are taught certain doctrines on disputed questions as if they were unquestionable

truths, when they are incapable of judging, and every influence is employed to deepen the impression. This is the true origin of their belief. * * * The opinions of ninety-nine persons out of every hundred are formed mainly by education, and a government can decide in whose hands the national education is to be placed, what subjects it is to comprise, and what principles it is to convey. The opinions of the great majority of those who emancipate themselves from the prejudices of their education are the results in a great measure of reading and discussion; and a government can prohibit all books, and expel all teachers that are adverse to the doctrine it holds."

We have seen some attempts of Christian writers to flatter the public that after the enactment of such a prohibition matters would go on without much perceptible change; Christian teachers would still continue to be appointed; and the general character of the education would continue to be moral and religious. But such charitable souls know little of the people who are driving this car of revolution, if they do not know that they are most frantically laboring to expel all christian teachers, and to occupy their chairs with their own disciples. One of the principal leaders of this crusade, Rev. O. B. Frothingham, (New York *Independent*, July 12, 1866), thus categorically states the demand: "It is asked, 'Is a teacher less prepared to instruct the people in letters, because to the learning of the schools, and the wisdom of men, he adds divine teaching, and the Word of God? We answer frankly, yes, if the two classes are mingled together, or if the teaching of divinity and the Word of God crowd out, take precedence of, limit, define, or color the instruction in letters, or the wisdom of men.'" "Rationalists and Unitarians, who reject the scheme of salvation, whose religion is chiefly ethical, who preach the interests of this life, intellectual culture, domestic virtue, social kindness, the priceless worth of the simply human relations, may mingle such religion as they have with education, because education is

their religion. But evangelical men, who are supremely interested in the salvation of souls, cannot confound them with secular interests without encountering the dangers of compromising both, not in the regards of the people only, but in their own elements." Thus it is avowed that, not only the Bible, and all religious instruction, but all evangelical men, also, are to be excommunicated from our public schools. We must at least give credit to the frankness with which our enemies issue their proclamation of war against religion and all religious people. If any evangelical man mistakes the nature of this conflict he must not charge his delusion upon any misrepresentation of their object by the anti-christian leaders; they plainly and loudly declare their design to deliver our children from the incubus of religion, and from the influence of men who care for the salvation of souls.

It is possible, however, to advance still further in the abolition of all restraints upon the free will of the young sovereigns of the universe. After we have prohibited the Bible, and all religious instructions, and all attempts to color or define instruction in science or letters by religious prepossessions, and have thus got our boys well rid of any superstitious fear of God, we may proceed to deliver them from any regard to man or, at least, from any fear of punishment for the exuberent indulgence of their nature. Not only corporal punishment, but every kind of punishment, is to be abolished in the schools. Dr. Hedge thus exhorts the preceptors of Harvard, the most venerable of our universities: "Abolish, I would say, your whole system of marks, college rank, and compulsory tasks." "Professors should not be responsible for the manners of students beyond the legitimate operation of their personal influence. There should be no penalty beyond that of expulsion, and that only in the way of self-defence against positively noxious and dangerous members. Let the civil law take care of civil offences." The civil law, however, as we shall see, must also be considerably mutilated to match the dogmas

of the absolute supremacy of man, and the prohibition of religion.

Thus far the process of reformation has been mainly of an expurgatory nature. The school has been cleansed of the Bible, and religion, and of all religious people. What and whom are we to place instead. We must have teachers of some sort; what sort of teachers shall we select out of the irreligious part of the community? What sort of morals and manners shall they teach after we have prohibited the Bible, and all religion, and any concern for the salvation of souls? For nobody supposes that education consists in teaching children to read, write, and cipher; neither Christians nor anti-Christians intend to confine their exertions to any such puerilities. Some standard of conduct must be adopted; right must be enforced by some kind of motives; wrong must be deprecated; and some object must be presented to the youthful mind as worthy of the labor of life. Now what doctrine of existence shall we present in our schools as the basis of education, after we have ruled out religion, and abjured our souls?

Here, however, we are met by the proposition that the parents shall take the religious culture of their children wholly into their own hands, and that they should supplement the defect of the schools in this particular. The schools shall teach simply science and literature, apart from all religious ideas, and the parents shall supply the religion at home.

This is truly a marvelous discovery. Will any man endeavor to imagine to himself a scheme of science apart from all religious ideas, other than Atheism? *That is the precise description of the Positive Philosophy.* Has any person conceived the idea of the history of Greece, of Rome, of Europe, apart from all religious ideas? Especially original would be a history of the settlement of New England expurgated of the religious element. Let us endeavor to imagine poetry purged of sentiment, and music composed to the scale of the physical sciences. Shall we, for fear of

doctrines, confine ourselves to the rule of three? No! That will never do. Education means doctrine of some sort or another. The proposal, in plain English, is simply that the children shall learn religion at home, and atheism at school.

Bishop Ullathorne, a Popish clergyman of Birmingham, thus forcibly argues against the proposed secular style of educating children into an ungodly morality: "The soul, which is the chief part of man, is to be left in the school of an uncultivated waste, with nothing to feed on but the hard, dry, sapless, bits and scraps of natural morality, selected with a view of excluding the expression in them of Christian doctrine and Christian morality. Now, this kind of moral teaching puts the self-reliance of man in place of his dependence upon God. It inculcates the duty of man to man, without resting the sense of that duty upon his conscience, and his duty to God. It teaches obedience to human and social laws, without resting them on their only firm foundation, which is the command and law of God. It urges the pursuit of truth, while it stops short of that divine, eternal, and revealed truth from which all other truth derives its light and its significance. It teaches youth to think, but stays him from thinking of God. It prescribes the right of man, but it discards the rights of God; and where the rights of God over man are discarded, the rights of man have but poor and feeble powers of enforcement left them." (*The Advance*, Dec. 23, 1869.)

Infidel science will be best taught by infidel teachers. Modern atheism is simply science ignoring God and religion. By getting into professors' and teachers' chairs in France and Germany, and inculcating ceaselessly their antichristian doctrines, now as science, now as philosophy, now disguised in history, and again concealed in a treatise on political economy, infidels have succeeded in sapping the faith and loyalty of the millions of Europe, and in ripening mankind for the tremendous crisis now imminent, in which five millions of armed men, destitute of all fear of God, and of all

faith in each other, are about to be let loose upon mankind, to plunder, besiege, bombard, ravish, and murder, and extend the horrors of the French Revolution over the astonished human race. The feet of the great European Colossus — the earthly material civilization on which it is supported, moistened by the continual dropping of atheism, have been softened into miry clay, and the crash is inevitable. The same process is now begun, and proceeds, according to our more energetic nature, with greater rapidity in America. If emigration continues, and indifferentism progresses for another twenty years, as they have for twenty years past, the American catastrophe may not lag far behind the downfall of European civilization. The same atheistic doctrines will produce the same results.

The atheistic doctrines are publicly avowed here on the platform; as in Chicago at the Sangerfest, where one of the speakers is reported, without contradiction, as saying: "Let us leave hell to the devils, if there be a hell; let us leave heaven to God and his angels; and the Germans shall rule America." On the stage, in the Sunday theatres, they are more unblushingly avowed; as by Lindenmuller (*New York Times*, May 2, 1860): "I openly confess that I am an Atheist. What is an Atheist? An Atheist believes only what he sees. Here the wealthy classes have seven days' rest in the week, instead of one, as we have; and they want to take away from us this one. If these hypocrites would be consistent, they must stay away from the church on the Sabbath, for God commanded, as they say, that they should rest on that day. Is not the bawling of psalms and prayers a great labor? But all labor is prohibited to them on the Sabbath. What think ye of the justice of God? I don't think much of it. * * * We must multiply more such theatres as mine, so as to compete with the churches; and then the preachers will become play-actors and let us alone." The following extract from the *Constitution* of the Society organized in Lindenmuller's Sunday Theatre, in New York, was presented by him in evidence on the trial

of his case, in 1860: "We believe in the immortality of the soul implanted in us by the goddess 'Nature.' We believe in the Sacred Beings, who, by the strength of their souls, have guided thousands to the paths of mortality and nature. We believe that the goddess Nature, Morality and Humanity, form a Trinity before which we bow down. We battle and work for this, our religion, by moral representations, by delineations of the light and shady sides of human life. We strive to elevate men to become noble citizens of the universe. We declare these, our Sunday acts, to be our religious mode of worship."

In the New York *Sunday Herald*, Feb. 26, 1860, an advertisement of another of these religious modes of worship contains the following;

"Concert every SUNDAY EVENING, on which occasion a double orchestra is engaged, under the able direction of Professor Guseman.

THE YOUNG LADIES

THE YOUNG LADIES

who attend to the wants of visitors, are another attractive feature at this establishment; their prepossessing appearance, and polite and affable behaviour, is acknowledged by all visitors. Admission only 15 cents.

PRETTY WAITER GIRLS,
PRETTY WAITER GIRLS,"

And so on, repeated in capital letters, fifty-four times, down to the bottom of the column, with invitations in smaller type interspersed. All this, be it observed, is exhibited as the *religion* of these people, for which they claim liberty of conscience, and the protection of the laws. The columns of any German daily paper will furnish abundance of similar notices.

Of course it is quite natural that such persons should be ill pleased with American laws regulating marriage, and rendering it authoritative. The *Chicago Tribune*, however, contains a letter dated May 6, 1868, signed by Geo. A.

Shufeldt, Jr., which presents the following simple solution of the difficulty: "If they may become man and wife by consent, why may they not separate by consent? It seems that the only part the law is called upon to perform in the transaction is to compel the parties to provide for, and take care of the results of the marriage, in the same manner as it does in the case of any other partnership. There is no greater reason why a man and woman should be compelled to live together, and make their lives a hell upon earth, than there is that two men who had formed an unfortunate connection in business should be compelled by the law to maintain their connection until one or the other died." A widely circulated religious paper, in favor of the exclusion of the Bible and of religion from the schools, also takes similar ground, and argues against the binding obligation of marriage between persons who have made themselves disagreeable to each other.

The alarming increase of divorces shows that these doctrines are not mere speculations, but are fast ripening into practice. Let us keep in mind their bearing upon the system of morals to be taught in our schools after we have expelled the Bible as offensive to the consciences of these reformers of marriage, and of the priests and priestesses of the Sunday Theatres. After we have expelled all evangelical teachers, shall we invite the pretty "waiter-girls" to teach our daughters morals? The same papers which advocate the exclusion of the Bible, advocate the largest liberty of divorce, and removal of the restrictions made by marriage laws. The same persons who demand the expulsion of all evangelical teachers from the schools, are foremost in consecrating, by their presence and prayers, the transgression of existing marriage laws. This is not an accidental connection; it is a legitimate result of the adoption of an anti-Christian standard of morals, which calls evil good, and good evil, and baptizes adultery as an ordinance of religion. It is no new thing to the reader of Church history. Immoral heresies were common during the first three centuries.

Nor does the student of prophecy need to be astonished at its reappearance, since opposition to marriage is expressly predicted as one of the assaults of the lawless one whom the Lord shall destroy with the flames of his coming. As the ancient heretics denounced the Bible on account of its opposition to their lewdness, so do our modern reformers protest against the introduction of so vile a book into our schools.

Rev. Thos. Vickers thus denounces the immoralities of the Bible in his speech on the school question, in Cincinnati: (*Gazette*, Oct. 18, 1869.) "Time would fail me if I were to attempt even to allude to all the frightful outrages committed against public morals and private decency by some of God's especial friends in the Old Testament; nay, done in many cases not merely with His permission, but by His express command. And I fear some of the morality of the New Testament is open to very serious objection. I say that knowing what I am saying, and I say it deliberately. Those gentlemen stated from this platform, that they had never heard the morality of the Book called in question. I call it in question. At any rate, most of my Christian friends, I honor them in saying it, are much better men and women than they would be if governed by certain parts of the morality of the New Testament.

* * * * Some men came to Him (Jesus) one day, and asked Him, How is it about this matter of divorce? Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife except for the one cause? And just allow me to ask if the morality of our laws in every state in the Union is based upon the explicit teachings of the New Testament in this matter? No! the laws of every state in this Union contravene the plainest teachings of the New Testament, *and they ought to.*"

That a code of morals based upon the actual practice of society could be introduced into the schools, need not be doubted, for, in fact, so far as regards this very doctrine of free-trade in marriage, it is actually done; it has been formulated into a principle of Political Economy by the lead-

ing advocate of exclusion of religion from education, John Stuart Mill, in a work which is now used as a text-book in some American schools, (*Principles of Political Economy*, II., 581), a work cited and expounded as authoritative by the leading German and English daily papers, and which has been favorably criticised by some religious newspapers, and on the strength of such recommendations, introduced into the libraries of some Christian literary associations. Mill thus advocates the largest liberty of divorce: "The practical maxim of leaving contracts free is not applicable without great limitations in cases of engagements in perpetuity, and the law should be extremely jealous of such engagements; should refuse its sanction to them where the obligations they impose are such as the contracting party can not be a competent judge of; if it ever does sanction them, it should take every possible security for their being contracted with foresight and deliberation; and in compensation for not permitting the parties themselves to revoke their engagement, should grant them a release from it on a sufficient case made out before an impartial authority. These considerations are eminently applicable to marriage, the most important of all case of engagement for life."

While, however, the ceremony of marriage, and the consequent existence of the family, are to be borne with as evils, we are taught by no means to make provision for their continuance, but should educate our children, as Mill teaches us, to look forward to a higher and nobler common life, to merge the family in the community, as a far higher degree of morality. Indeed, it is on the plea of substituting a purer morality than that of Christ, that we are asked to banish the Bible. Thus Mill (*Political Economy*, II, 352): "And in the moral aspect of the question, which is still more important than the economical, something better should be aimed at than to disperse mankind on the earth in single families, each ruled internally, as families now are, by a patriarchal despot, and having scarcely any com-

munity of interest, or necessary mental communion with other human beings. The domination of the head of the family over the other members, in this state of things is absolute; while the effect in his own mind tends to the concentration of all interests in the family considered as a concentration of self, and absorption of all passions in that of exclusive possession, of all cares in those of preservation and acquisition. As a step out of the merely animal state into the human, out of reckless abandonment to brute instincts into prudential foresight and self-government, this moral condition may be seen without displeasure. But if public spirit, generous sentiments, or true justice and equality are desired, association, not isolation, of interests is the school in which these excellencies are nurtured."

It is obvious that the existing ideas and institutions of property must be greatly modified to meet these theories of community of women and children. Not merely to the crowded and half starved millions of Europe and Asia, to whom almost any change might seem an improvement, is communism preached as the millennium of happiness; the people of the United States are specially exhorted to a change of social life, and held up to the ridicule of the world for our energy in business, and eagerness to get on in the world. "I confess I am not charmed with the ideal of life held out by those who think that the normal state of human beings is that of struggling to get on; that the trampling, crushing, elbowing, and treading on each other's heels, which form the existing type of social life, are the most desirable lot of humankind, or anything but the disagreeable symptoms of one of the phases of industrial progress. The Northern and Middle States of America are a specimen of this stage of civilization in very favorable circumstances; having apparently got rid of all social injustice and inequalities that affect persons of the Caucasian race and male sex, while the proportion of population to capital and land is such as to ensure abundance to every able bodied member of the community who does not forfeit it by misconduct. They have the six

points of Chartism, and they have no poverty; and all that these advantages seem to have yet done for them (notwithstanding some incipient signs of a better tendency), is that the life of the one sex is devoted to dollar hunting, and of the other to breeding dollar hunters. This is not the kind of a social perfection which philanthropists to come will feel any very eager desire to assist in realizing."

We have now the system before us, and can better comprehend its details. It is complete in all its parts. The end to be accomplished is the overthrow of our existing Christian society, and the substitution of the socialism of the Red Republic. The means for the accomplishment of this revolution are various, but include the control of our national system of education. The Bible and all religious instruction, are to be prohibited in the schools. All evangelical teachers are to be expelled. All books and teachers adverse to the doctrine of the government are to be suppressed. Communism is to be presented as a great advance on private property. Marriage is to be discouraged, and divorce made easy. The family is to give place to larger associations of mankind; and the blessing of God, in the increase of the human race, is to be treated as an immorality. Each feature of this scheme derives character from the whole, and adds its own peculiar scowl of defiance against God, and contempt for man. Taught by the experience of centuries, and the failure of former half-way measures, the deviser of this last grand assault upon God and man has carefully cleared his system of all elements capable of creating remorse; has ignored God, conscience, and retribution; has made provision for the stupefaction of the soul by sensual lusts; and has based his system upon the belief of the falsehood, that there is no power superior to the human soul. He desires the control of our public schools, to use them as a propaganda of these doctrines and practices. He claims that we shall concede equal rights to his system and to Christianity; and alleges that our Constitution promises him such assistance.

⌚ This claim we shall discuss in another article.

ARTICLE II.

PROFESSOR SHEPARD'S SERMONS.*

It is fortunate for the student in Homiletics, that he has at command not only many able treatises on this subject, but also an affluent literature in which the masters in this department have embodied the principles of the art. Thus he is able to study the pulpit discourse both in the abstract discussion of its principles, and in their practical application and embodiment. A careful study of sermons is one of the best means by which to become skilled in pulpit discourse, for each author of a volume of sermons has given us for examination the ripest fruits of his knowledge of Homiletics. We can thus see — to use a common phrase — how the thing is done; how these Homiletic principles take on body and form. It is especially fortunate when the author of a volume of sermons was himself an acknowledged master of the whole subject — one who had devoted a long life to the study and teaching of the science. Surely the carefully prepared discourses of such a man are worthy of earnest study; and though to criticize them may savor of presumption, yet the attempt, if rightly made, cannot but prove beneficial to the critics.

The volume before us contains thirty-one sermons, selected doubtless with care by his colleague, Prof. Talcott, from the whole number of discourses left by Prof. Shepard. They may therefore be regarded as the best specimens of his manner of preaching. It may be well to look at them in the order of the chief parts of a discourse.

In the selection of *Texts* our author shows excellent judgment. They are neither hackneyed, nor sensational, but fresh, varied, and inviting, while embracing the chief themes

* Sermons by the late Rev. George Shepard, Professor in Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.; with a Memorial by Prof. D. S. Talcott. Boston: Nichols & Noyes.

of the Gospel. Whether they have, in all cases, a sufficiently close connection with their subjects, will be noticed hereafter.

His *Introductions* are, in general, models of appropriateness and brevity. With his theme clearly before him, the preacher seems intent on bringing his audience as quickly as possible under its power. He starts with his hearers at a point as near his subject as he is able, and leads them to it by a right line. If the text itself clearly indicates the theme, he sometimes introduces his hearers to it by a single sentence. His historical introductions are especially felicitous. Seizing the prominent points of a narrative, he sets it vividly before us with a few bold sketches. His sermons on "*The Shipwreck of Paul*," and "*Christ's Comings*," may be cited as examples.

The few *Expositions* our author gives us, are equally good. They are clear and brief, and not unduly protracted by an attempt to explain what needs no explanation. They are generally given, too, in the concrete, and not in the abstract form. See the sermons on "*The Moral Discipline of Giving*," and on "*Seeking first the Kingdom of God and his Righteousness*."

In both the relevancy and the statement of his *Subjects*, Prof. Shepard seems, at times, open to criticism. His themes do not always appear to grow directly out of their texts. For example, in the discourse from the text, "*For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth*," the author deduces the subject "*The Diversions from Preaching*," or, as he gives it in the body of the sermon, he is "to state some of those things, circumstances, causes, which are operating to cut down the effects of our preaching." Now this is, at best, only an inference from a subordinate clause of this text. The main thought is contained in the first clause, "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ;" and the subject deduced from it would properly be, *Belief in the Gospel of Christ no cause of shame*, and the reasons assigned for which, in the subordinate clause, might easily take on

the form of the textual discourse: I. Because the Gospel of Christ is the *power of God*; II. Because it is the power of God *unto salvation*; III. Because it is the power of God *unto salvation to every one that believeth*. The author does not always put his themes into the terse form of which he is certainly master. Instead of setting forth the thought on which he is to discourse, in a brief proposition, either logical or rhetorical, without explanations or redundancies, so that it may be easily retained by the memory, he, in a few cases, clothes it in a form well nigh the opposite. In the sermon entitled "*Escape for thy Life*," he announces as his subject, "the kind, the tone, of effort which will bring us to the secure place, and finally, to the blessed home;" which might perhaps be better stated thus: the kind of effort necessary to salvation. So in the sermon on the text, "*Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name given among men whereby we must be saved*," he announces the theme thus: "There is only one way by which it is possible for us to be saved, and that is by Christ;" which might take the briefer form; Salvation possible only through Christ, or, Christ the only Saviour.

In the *Plans* of his discourses, Prof. Shepard is, in general, worthy of imitation. He has a definite impression to make, or point to carry, and masses his materials with fine generalship to sweep the ground. He rarely scatters his forces, but hurls them against a single position. There is no backward, rarely a side moment, but the thoughts move on a compact force, and in a right line, toward one object. He has also, like an experienced general, no set way of bringing his forces on the field, and arranging them on it, caring not so much for military forms, as for gaining the victory. He gives us a delightful variety of plans in these thirty-one sermons. We have, now a plan for an Expository discourse, now for a Textual, and again for a Descriptive, and so on of the rest. He is particularly happy in the plans of his Descriptive sermons. Setting forth usually no formal statement respecting the person or circumstance

brought to view in the narrative, but letting the individual or event stand for the theme, he sketches before us, with a few bold strokes, the prominent traits in the character, or points in the narrative, and then lets the subject develop itself into various heads of reflections and suggestions. The theme thus becomes a centre of light, a sun sending forth its radiant beams in all directions. The sermons on "*The Shipwreck of Paul*;" "*Elijah the Tishbite*;" "*The Giver, or the Two Mites*;" "*The Death of Elisha*;" "*Christ's Bodily and Spiritual Healings*;" are examples of this kind. These main heads, or points, in his Descriptive sermons are often very fresh and instructive. The plan on the text, "*Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief*," is very fine, and grows directly out of the text, setting forth: I. A true faith; II. An imperfect faith; III. The deep feeling that it was an imperfect faith; IV. The feeling of the imperfection, as conducive to the success of the application. In a few of his discourses, however, the plans do not seem to have the usual compactness and unity. The text of the sermon on "*The Confession of Sin*," includes four verses, each containing a separate truth, only one of which is developed in the discourse, the text properly being only the ninth verse: "*If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*," from which the preacher deduces at the outset: "The duty of confession of sins, and the blessed consequences of that confession." This the reader naturally supposes is to be his subject. He is to treat, first, of the duty of confession, and then to set forth as motives to its performance, the blessed results attending it. But the preacher, assuming the duty to be clearly taught in the sacred Word, after setting forth at length the nature of true confession, and showing that it involves "*the forsaking of sin*," in other words, true repentance, goes on in the second place, to present motives to wholly another kind of confession of sin, a confession which, by his express limitation, does not involve repentance. (p. 169). Hence in the two parts

of his sermon he is, in effect, discoursing on *two* kinds of confession of sin, and in the last part is wholly at variance with his text. In this way he well nigh paralyzes what would otherwise be a powerful discourse. The theme might have taken some such form as this: The blessed results of penitent confession of sins; or this—The penitent confession of sins secures the divine forgiveness and purification. The *nature* of true confession would properly be set forth under the head of the exposition, and then the *happy results* of such confession would occupy the body of the sermon as motives to the performance of it; as, for example: I. It secures the divine forgiveness; II. It brings peace to the troubled conscience; III. It brings cleansing to the character. But if it were deemed best to set forth at considerable length, the nature of confession, the subject might be stated thus: The nature of true confession of sins, and its blessed consequences—in which case the exposition would be placed in the body of the sermon, and the discourse would be partly explanatory, and partly persuasive.

In the sermon from the text, "*And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life,*" the preacher, after announcing as his object in the discourse, "to show the sinner that he is not willing; that these words of Christ are indeed true;" adds, "My line of argument is simply this, namely: to point out some of the preventives, the difficulties, the hinderances, in the way of coming to Christ, selecting such as all will confess may be removed, and then show that where there is no attempt to remove even these, there is no serious wish to become a Christian, and, as such, to be saved." His plan is evidently defective, for, if closely adhered to, it would compel him, first, to set forth the difficulties in the way of coming to Christ, and then, in the second part of his sermon, to go over much the same ground again, to show that the sinner makes no effort to remove those difficulties. It would have been better to set forth, at once, the sinner's unwillingness to

come to Christ, as shown by his conduct in the difficulties named, thus: I. From his settled spirit of inattention to the subject of religion; II. From his persistence in outward acts of disobedience; III. From his refusal to perform essential exterior duties, as prayer.

The plan of Sermon XVII, which, on the whole, is perhaps the best discourse in the volume, seems somewhat deficient in unity. The sermon is founded on the text: "*In whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them;*" and the preacher "proposes to speak of the character and methods of the adversary's operation," which he does under the three following heads, the most neatly expressed of any in the volume: I. His intent to do evil; II. His power to do evil; III. His methods of doing evil. After dismissing his first and second heads in about a page each, the preacher discusses quite fully his third head—the methods of the adversary. It would give greater unity and simplicity to the plan, as well as make it more nearly conform to the text, if the theme were, the methods by which the adversary blinds the minds of men; and the first and second main divisions of the sermon, as it now stands, viz.: "His intent to do evil," and "His power to do evil," were noticed in the introduction, thus leaving the entire body of the discourse for the discussion of the subject proper.

In the *statement of the main divisions* of his plans, our author is often open to criticism. They are sometimes not sufficiently prominent, and often not neatly cut. It is surprising that such a master of condensed expression of thought should often clothe the chief thoughts of his sermons in loose expressions. Here, if anywhere, he ought to show his skill. Yet we often here find him bungling. This results, at times, from an attempt to do what it would seem never should be done in the statement of a main head, to blind the explanation of the thought with its announcement. If the thought stands out by itself, clearly

and nicely cut, it can be easily perceived, and remembered. It seems almost unnecessary to cite examples which may be readily found by looking through the volume. (pps. 24, 25, 132, 170). But sometimes in his *resumé* of the main divisions, he is a model in condensed and clear statement, reducing each head into a single word. (p. 10).

In the *Development* of his plans, Prof. Shepard has little to do with formal reasoning. He rarely deals in argumentative discussion. He appeals largely to the consciousness and consciences of his hearers, and plants himself with regal authority on the Word of God. He believes, and therefore speaks, and he demands an equally undoubted faith on the part of his auditors. There is something almost apostolic in the authoritative manner in which he sets forth and enforces divine truth. Selecting highly practical themes, he develops them in the most plain, direct, and practical way. He shows no great amount of secular learning, but an intimate knowledge of the sacred Word, and great skill in using it. In the descriptive development he seems most successful. Sketching with graphic pen a person or event, he makes his theme stand forth before us with life-like vividness. The few figures of speech he uses are generally in the form of metaphor, and always vivid, and to the point.

The *Conclusions* in Prof. Shepard's discourses are, in general, remarkably good. They are never a mere appendage tacked to the development for the sake of rounding out the sermon, but the proper outgrowth of the theme to its fruitage. In each sermon the preacher evidently had his eye fixed on the application he designed to make, and constructed every part of the discourse with direct reference to it. The sermon gathers volume and power as it approaches its conclusion, through which it pours itself, as a noble river through its mouth into the sea. In his conclusions, Prof. Shepard's characteristics as a preacher strikingly show themselves. They are remarkably pointed — aimed directly at the heart and the conscience —

and couched in most clear, terse, vivid, and tender language. He especially excels in the conclusions of his descriptive discourses, which are very fresh and instructive.

The *Style* of Prof. Shepard, as exhibited in these sermons, is somewhat uniform, and of a very marked character. It has little variety, and the same striking characteristics of expression run through the volume. The words he uses are largely Anglo-Saxon—the words of common life, in daily use among the people. Although sometimes rough and ungainly, they are full of life and energy. Indeed, it admits of a question whether he does not, at times, allow his partiality for such words to carry him *too far*, making his style too uniformly demonstrative, and not giving to it sufficient variety of light and shade. He sometimes indulges in the use of obsolescent and obsolete words; such as, greatening, promulging, variant, ribbonry, exprobatation, unescapable, and the like.

In the construction of his sentences, Prof. Shepard had evidently in view their delivery from the pulpit, and so fashioned them that they should conform as nearly as possible to the most forcible extemporaneous expression. Hence we find in them frequent repetitions of forms of construction, which would be out of place in compositions designed only for the eye. Yet his sentences are, for the most part, models for forcible utterance of thought. In his most fervid utterances, his compact sentences came from his lips, as steaming balls leap from the cannon's mouth. His description of primitive preaching, as given in his first sermon, sets forth as well some of the leading characteristics of his own. "There is no linking of a process, or backing of an argument, or felicity of figure or phrase; only this: the great things of God are boldly given, done with a rough depicting, a vehement down-rightness, a persistent affirming. The people are told, It is so, just as it is here written in the Book; and it is amazing. The external all with you is at stake. See the rage and swelter of the devouring fire!

Behold the Lamb of God. Now is the time! Escape for your life. And the rugged and steaming words take hold; and men in crowds, that never heard before, hear now; and the weakness and the foolishness strangely become to them a power of redemption." Our author often makes use of the antithesis to give forcible expression to a thought. He thus states his second remark in the conclusion of his sermon on "Caleb": "It is further obvious that what is wanted in our time is not so much more Christians as more Christianity." In his discourse on "The End at Hand," speaking of prayer extorted through fear, he says: "What is praying in a storm good for; what avails it, if there were none in fair weather? So, in the final day, there will unquestionably be a great deal of praying when the graves are opening and the dead are rising and the world is burning; but what will it avail? An event or motive of this sort made palpable, and brought right upon one with infinite and visible pressure, is enough to make a demon pray; and he would be a demon when he had done."

There is also often discernible in his sermons a keen, quiet wit, bordering at times on sarcasm, which he sometimes wields with great effect. In this way, he often, by a single flash, lets in a flood of light on his view of the matter in hand. We are left in no doubt as to what he thinks on the comparative merits of two opposite systems of medical treatment, when he says in his sermon on Elijah: "Whatever may be true in medicine, God's system of moral cure is by contraries." Nor have we any doubt in what estimation he holds a certain class of persons, whom, after sketching men of the Elijah stamp, he thus portrays in this same discourse: "How different from another sort the world breeds and brings before us—delicate and self-indulgent, living to please themselves; your pliant, willow men, your silken men, prim-toilet men, who carry their fire and smoke between their teeth. What will such accomplish for God and humanity? Our expectations are very low in that direction, and we can not help its being so." Not less clearly does

the preacher's opinion of certain popular forms of worship come out in the conclusion of another sermon. "It follows from the preceding, that every body is not fit for the kingdom of God, because every thing people imagine does not constitute a fitness. The profession, the form, the ceremony does not, the giving heed to the pastimes of religion, the matutinal show, or the twilight entertainments of song and prayer." Examples of this sort might be multiplied almost at pleasure.

Although the sermons of Prof. Shepard do not abound in figures and illustrations, yet they give evidence that he was not wanting in imagination, and knew how to use figures of speech, especially the metaphor, with great effect. He was too much in earnest to give his imagination free wing, but he could use it, as few other men, to hurl a bolt dazzling with light, to its mark. It seems almost needless to cite examples of this kind to those who have the volume in their hands, yet we can not forbear to refer to one or two. In the discourse on "*The Moral Discipline of Giving*," we have this passage: "To all those, then, who have given leanly and grudgingly we say: Arise and give, give bountifully, give heartily, give willfully, just because something within resists and says 'I won't,' give the more, and still more, from the very teeth and grip of the old retaining passion. Give with the measure and intent to crucify it—that hundred the nail, that thousand the spike, that ten thousand the spear—and so proceed and persist till the base and slimy thing is wholly dead."

† In his sermon on, "*The Glory of Christ*," speaking of the mysterious delay of the full manifestation of that glory on earth, he exclaims, "Let not your faith falter for this. Let it ride still that ocean of grace gathered in Christ; safely and confidently ride, because anchored on the unfailing bottom of eternal promise."

‡ In the conclusion to his sermon entitled, "Help thou mine unbelief," he thus urges the sinner to come to Christ in spite of his unbelief: "If you cannot believe, or think

you cannot, come and ground your argument before God on that. If you cannot confess your sins, come and confess to God that you cannot confess. Tell him, with dry, rigid bitterness of spirit, that you cannot; that the rock within you will not relent; and ask him to smite the rock, that some penitential drops may ooze from the flinty centre."

Such seem to be the chief Homiletic excellences and defects of this volume of sermons. The discourses, as a whole, are not so brilliant as those of Robertson, or able and original as those of Bushnell. Yet they are very clear and forcible exhibitions of the truths of which they treat. They have a directness, force, and downright earnestness of expression, which must have carried all before them. Some of them are as full of power as Leyden-jars of electricity. And we can readily imagine the impassioned they made, when aided by the fine presence, the powerful voice, the solemn air, and impressive action of the preacher. Remarkable as these sermons are for brevity,—only ten out of the thirty-one taking much over a half-hour for delivery, and some consuming even less than that time,—yet every one of them must have left a distinct and permanent impression on an audience.

Prof. Shepard's sermons are a valuable contribution to pulpit literature, and will well repay closest study by him, who, in the sublimest of all arts, the art of "winning souls," aspires to be "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed."

ARTICLE III.

THE BASIS OF SUFFRAGE.

THE earliest governments among men are certainly not elective. They are parental. The infant is governed with no opportunity to elect his ruler. He finds himself under a necessity of obeying. As soon as he is capable of moral discernment, he feels morally bound to obey the being in whose power he is. He does not question the legitimacy of the authority that is over him; and no school of opinion has, so far as we are informed, seriously called in question the rightfulness of that authority; or if it ever has been questioned, it is only amid the fierce discussions of all the foundation principles of social order and moral obligation, which have sprung up in the age in which we are living.

So natural is the authority of the parent, that, in rude and barbarous ages, it is not confined to his own proper family, but extends to all his descendants so long as he lives; and even when he is dead, his power descends to the oldest, or the strongest, or the bravest of his descendants; and thus an incipient monarchy is established. In this way it is made to appear perfectly natural that monarchy should be, as in fact it is, the earliest government of nations. The power of the father runs most easily and naturally into the power of the king. All nations with whose history we are acquainted were in their beginnings monarchies, limited perhaps in some instances by aristocratic institutions, but without any popular elections.

But the laws of human nature are very uniform, and no law is better established, than that the rule of a monarch, unchecked by any accountability to the will and judgment of his subjects, will soon become selfish and tyrannical. The rights of the subject will be violated, and his liberty destroyed. Hence the lessons of history teach us with

great unanimity, that as nations advance in civilization and general intelligence, they feel the necessity of erecting the popular will into some barrier against the tyranny of the government. It is not because men have any natural intuition that they have a right to choose their own rulers, but because they do intuitively discern their own rights of property, liberty, and life, and learn by experience the necessity of protecting them. Hence the fact which is almost universal in history, that, as nations advance in civilization, they are sooner or later shaken by revolutions, achieved or attempted, in favor of popular government.

This tendency was scarcely less prevalent in the ancient world than in the modern. All the States of Greece were in their beginnings monarchies, and all sooner or later underwent a democratic revolution. The same is true of Rome, and probably of all those states of Italy and Sicily, which Rome subdued in the progress of her arms. In all these cases, in greater or less degree, the suffrages of the people were employed to restrain the tyrannical tendencies of the government, and to protect the rights of the individual. Probably in no State, either ancient or modern, except our own Republic, has popular suffrage ever been carried as far as at Athens.

But the doctrine of the equal right of all men to vote, considered as natural and inalienable, was never dreamed of in the republics of antiquity. There is no trace of such a sentiment either in Greek or Roman literature. Both at Rome and Athens there were vast multitudes of slaves, who were not only denied the elective franchise, but every right of humanity. And even those who did vote were so arranged in classes according to property, that the vote of one rich man outweighed that of many poor men. The republics of antiquity had no theory of rights; every man wished to be free, and secure to himself the right of suffrage as a protection to his freedom, if he could; while on a vast scale the stronger combined to trample down every right of the weaker.

It is in the political struggles of our English ancestry, that we first find any attempt to construct a theory of the right of suffrage. The form which that theory took was, that there should be no taxation without representation—that the sovereign had no right to take the property of the subject, unless he had by his representative given his consent. This was the ground on which the advocates of liberty stood, in all their conflicts with the Stuarts, and in all the fierce discussions which preceded and attended the American Revolution. But while they advocated this doctrine, and so many great and noble men gave their lives in defence of it, they had no thought of a theory of universal suffrage. Various fictions, to us unintelligible and inconceivable, were resorted to, in the endeavor to show that a vast non-voting population was still virtually represented. The thought, that every human being has a natural and inalienable right to a voice in the choice of the rulers and in making the laws he lives under, so that every one who is governed without such a personal voice is thereby oppressed, had never entered their minds.

It would be absurd to contend, that even the framers of the Declaration of Independence meant universal suffrage, or even thought of it, in using the strong language which they employed. At that very time, not only did slavery exist in most of the States, but in most of them the right of suffrage was limited by a property qualification. It is doubtful whether one of the signers of that instrument regarded the right to vote as one of the "inalienable rights" of which they spoke. That question had not then arisen. Even when they spoke of governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," they were far from meaning to imply that no one could be justly governed who had not a vote in choosing the men by whom the government was administered. They could not have intended or thought of such an application of their language; for they were maintaining governments in which no attempt was made to carry such a doctrine into practice.

What they did mean to assert was, that government is in its nature so dependent on the will of the governed, that when an existing government fails to protect their rights and promote their happiness, they have a right to abrogate it, and substitute a better in its stead. It was the farthest thing possible from their intentions to assert that any people has a right to overthrow and destroy a good and beneficent government, because they have had less influence in making and administering it than they desire, or think they ought to have.

It is only in the political discussions which have arisen in this country and Great Britain since the American Revolution, that any attempt has been made, any where or by any party, to establish and defend the right of suffrage as natural and inalienable, like one's right to enjoy life and the fruits of his own labor. At the present time there is, both in this country and Great Britain, if not a large party, one that is passionately in earnest, with many gifted and popular writers, who do place the right of suffrage on this basis; or rather, who assume that this is the conceded and undeniable basis of it, and proceed on this assumption to demand, as a logical and inevitable result, an extension of the elective franchise hitherto unheard of and unthought of in the history of the race.

We are not greatly solicitous about the result of this agitation. We have considerable confidence in the durability of nature's laws, and are not much alarmed when men and even women attempt to overthrow them. We are not pugnacious, and have no desire to take up the cudgel for this fight. But the subject is pressed upon us by the urgency of those who are advocating the proposed revolution, till we have no choice. If, therefore, we must engage in the conflict, we must begin at the beginning; and to begin at the beginning we must call in question this upstart assumption, which is the origin of the whole agitation.

Entirely irrespective of the spasmodic effort which is at present made to give to the right of suffrage an unheard

of extension, the subject sustains so important a relation to the foundations and to the whole structure of modern society, that it is of great importance to public peace, and the stability of free institutions, that the basis of suffrage should be exactly ascertained; and its limitations, if, indeed, it is admitted to have any, accurately defined. Without such an understanding of the subject in its first principles, it is impossible to give any permanency even to our fundamental law, or to protect society from perpetual unrest. Till the right of suffrage is settled upon principles that are known and recognized as just, excluded classes will perpetually clamor for admission; and when all other barriers are swept away, that of age will be assailed, and we shall find no resting place, till not only mothers shall vote, but be obliged to take their infants from their cradles, and carry them with them to the polls, to perform their duty as citizens, by casting their ballots with tiny hands.

Men talk very glibly and with much seeming complacency of universal suffrage; and yet we all know, if we will consider the matter, that our words do not mean what they seem to mean. The very phrase implies a fallacy. Universal suffrage never existed, and no enthusiast has been wild enough to propose it. No one ever will propose or advocate it. We are not born voters: certain qualifications are needful, by the admission of all, which none of us bring into the world with us. If we ever have them, we must acquire them. Some of both sexes never do acquire them. It must always be one of the duties of the legislator to draw the line between the voting and non-voting portion of the population. On what principle is that line to be drawn? Is the rule by which the legislator is to be guided in this matter, to be drawn from the consideration of the personal rights of the individual, or from a regard for the public weal? If the right to vote is, like right of property, natural and inalienable, doubtless the legislator must be governed by this as the dominant consideration. No legislator has any right to make a law depriving an infant of

property which a deceased father has willed him. The law must and will protect that infant in the possession of that property, before he has ever seen the light. He may be born a hopeless imbecile, but that property is his. He cannot manage it for himself, but the law will protect him in the possession and enjoyment of it.

If the right to vote is in like manner inalienable, it inheres in the infant of days. The law should protect him in it, and provide a guardian by whom it should be exercised for him and for his benefit and protection, till he is able to exercise it for himself. It should be as much the guardian's duty to vote for his ward, as to take care of his property, and secure to him the benefit of it. If the right of suffrage is natural and inalienable, then it is a provision which God has made for every human being for the protection of his rights, and it should never be dormant, more than the right of property. In that case every living father should not only vote in his own name, but cast a ballot also for each of his children. At majority the child should become independent in his vote, as he does in his property. If the right to vote is natural and inalienable, we cannot avoid this conclusion.

If the right to vote is natural and inalienable, we can give no reason for any of the discriminations which our laws make, and must make. No one supposes that infants are to be taken from their cradles to vote. The law must therefore prescribe the age at which one shall become a voter. How can this be determined, on the theory that the right to vote is natural and inalienable? Has a man an inalienable right to vote on his twenty-first birthday; but no right at all to vote on the day previous, should an election occur on that day? Is that the reason why the law gives the ballot in the one case and not in the other? Does a man acquire a natural and inalienable right the instant the clock strikes twelve, midnight, just twenty-one years after he was born? A very strange *natural, inborn*, right that. The line cannot be so drawn between voters and non-voters.

All the plausibility of the assumption comes from that theory of the origin of civil society, which resolves it into the social compact, and thus makes every one's obligation to society depend on his consent. But this theory is utterly untenable. Men do not enter society by consent or contract. They are born into it. Society envelopes and provides for us before we are born. It sanctions the very union of those to whom we owe our being, and throws its wing of protection over the mothers that bear us, in the times of their helplessness and suffering. It protects the life and the property of the unborn embryo. The attempt to resolve civil obligation into consent and contract is in the last degree absurd.

No man, no set of men have a right, as has been already remarked, to refuse submission to a government because they did not make it, and have not consented to it. If it is a good and beneficent government it is their own fault if they have not consented to it. The framers of the Declaration of Independence did not consider it sufficient justification of the colonies in rejecting the British yoke, that they had not consented to wear it; but made out a formidable enumeration of acts of injustice and oppression. Any people will feel a like necessity, if they would justify themselves in overthrowing an established government. The intuitive sense of justice in the human soul decides, that, no matter how the government was made, or by whom its rulers were chosen, if it is in its actual working just and beneficent, it ought to stand; men ought to consent to it, whether they have done so or not.

Happening to be in England during some of the darkest days of the rebellion, we daily encountered the argument: that, according to our own principles, established in our separation from Britain, the South had a right to be independent: that, in that struggle, we had settled the doctrine, that any people had a right to adopt just such a government as it might choose. We used to ask whether the doctrine would apply to Ireland; and received for answer,

of course, that that would be a very different case. But the fact that so miserable a fallacy was in the mouths of millions, showed us how dangerous to the peace of the world, are the inferences which come from the theory of the social compact, and how widely and mischievously the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence are misunderstood and misapplied. Never are those doctrines more delusively and dangerously applied, than when they are constructed into an argument to prove that the right to vote is natural and inalienable, and therefore universal.

We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion, that it is quite impossible to draw the line between voters and non-voters from any consideration of the natural rights of individuals. If the right to vote is such a right, then all have it, and always have it, and none must be excluded. In making the discriminations which are inevitable, the legislator must be guided by other indices. The ballot is not to be denied the boy of ten years, and given to the man of twenty-one, because the one has not, and the other has a natural right to it, but because the safety and well-being of society require the discrimination. This is the principle which dominates over the whole subject of suffrage. No man, no woman, no child, has any right to vote unless a due regard to the public weal permits and requires it. The two classes, voters and non-voters, must always exist; and the legislator must decide where a regard to the public welfare requires that the line which separates them should be drawn.

This question can be answered in no other way than by specifying those conditions, without the fulfilment of which, no one can be serviceable to his country by his vote. Five such conditions will, we think, be found to exist.

1. *True allegiance to the government in which one is to participate.*

States, nations, are like families; their interests are not the same; they are rivals; they are even liable to be hostile to each other. The very fact that a man is identified in

interest and affection with one, disqualifies him from taking any part in managing the affairs of another. No foreigner, though living among us, while he still retains his allegiance to the country of his birth, should ever be permitted to exercise the right of suffrage. If any matter of dispute arises between the two countries, his heart will not take side with us, but with the country from which he came. No foreigner should then be allowed the ballot, till he has resided long enough among us to have acquired a love of this as his country; and become willing to renounce his allegiance to the land of his birth, and transfer it whole and entire, to the country of his adoption. This is too obvious to require argument.

Nor should any one, either of foreign or native birth, be entrusted with the ballot, who acknowledges any religious or ecclesiastical authority which is hostile to that freedom of conscience, worship and instruction, which are fundamental to our free institutions. There is at this point a danger to our national tranquility which is threatening to assume huge proportions. No principle of free government is better settled than that the state is to provide for the rudimentary education of all the children born and reared under its protection. There is a large class of men among us, mostly of foreign birth and training, who, so far as they acquire the ballot, are using it to destroy this system of popular education, except so far as they can subject it to the control of an ecclesiastical power having its seat at Rome, and whose head is the meanest despot in Europe. Such men are not true American citizens. They owe allegiance to a foreign power, which is hostile to the foundation principles of our government. Perhaps the American people may soon learn, that one may acknowledge an allegiance, under the guise of religion, to an ecclesiastical power, which is utterly destructive of civil allegiance, and disqualifies him for the elective franchise. That man cannot be a loyal American citizen, who would wrest from the state the power to impart to the young a rudimental education; or

who regards the pretended revelations of Brigham Young, as of superior binding force to that law of marriage which is inwrought into the very structure of all Christian society, and is a part of that common law, which is the precious birth-right of the whole English-speaking race. The time may not be far distant, when we must draw a distinct and well-defined line between the sovereignty of the state, and the pretensions of men who assume to govern under the guise of religion.

2. *A certain degree of intelligence and mental culture.*

It may seem to some strange that, after having extended the ballot so widely and so recklessly as we have done, this question should be raised at all. But no sensible man will, after all, think of contradicting what we are saying. It is a fatal objection to giving the ballot to the infant, that he has not sufficient intelligence to use it wisely. No man believes that idiots or insane people should vote. The reason is obvious; they have not the power of forming an intelligent judgment of the men and the principles submitted to the action of the people. We cannot deny this principle. It is obvious, and obtrudes itself upon our view. Where then is the line to be drawn? Has every man the requisite intelligence who has lived twenty-one or any other definite number of years, no matter how ignorant and intellectually debased? The doctrine is shocking; it is monstrous; and nothing but evil is to be anticipated from applying it in the political life of the American people. Those States that have modified their constitutions, so as to require a certain grade of intelligence, as a condition of voting, have taken a step in the right direction. It is wise, perhaps experience will show that it is necessary, not to bring down the ballot to every man in his ignorance, but to place it within the reach of every one who will make the necessary exertion to acquire the requisite amount of knowledge.

3. *A Certain Degree of Moral Integrity.*—No man believes that either justice or expediency requires that, in

any general election, a poll should be opened in each of our State Prisons. The men whose crimes have rendered it necessary to confine them in prisons for the safety of society, are not to be trusted with the ballot. Nor has it ever been shown that there are not lower degrees of crime than would justify confinement in the penitentiary, which ought to be regarded as disqualifying one for the elective franchise. Not to specify other examples: Can the habitual drunkard be safely trusted with the ballot? He is untrue in his tenderest and most sacred domestic relations, and quite reckless of the duties which they imply. Is he likely to be more true to his country than to his family? He has made utter shipwreck of his own interests and destiny; he has blasted his own reputation; made his very person, once beautiful and noble, disgusting and loathsome; he has squandered his property, and reduced himself and a family he had sworn to support and protect, to starvation and beggary; he has violated every principle of honor and love which bound him to the wife of his bosom; and is he now fit to bear a part in the sacred trust of governing his country? The thing is preposterous and monstrous.

It is a source of great anxiety to all sober and patriotic people, how so to construct our laws as most effectually to discountenance drunkenness. We will venture the suggestion that hitherto we have failed, because our legislation has been wrong in principle. We have made the seller of intoxicating drinks the principal criminal, and the drunkard his pitiable but comparatively innocent victim. Far be it from us to urge any thing in mitigation of the seller's crime. But he is, after all, only an accomplice, while the drunkard is the principal in the crime; and before we can hope to attain to any considerable success in our legislation against drunkenness, we must so modify our laws as to recognize him in that relation.

It is high time that such changes were made in our constitution and laws, that drunkenness should be punishable before our courts as a crime; and that a universal consequence

of conviction of the crime of habitual or even frequent drunkenness should be the loss of the elective franchise. It is not to our present purpose to show that such legislation is imperatively required by a regard to public morality, and for the protection of the wives and children of drunkards; but it is to our purpose to remark, that it is a measure of the most urgent necessity for the safety of public liberty, and the preservation of public order. It is a solemn truth apparent to every thoughtful man, that if intemperance continues to increase at its present rate, and drunkards are permitted to retain the elective franchise and eligibility to office unimpaired, our boasted and cherished liberty is to be of very brief duration. It is a marvel almost beyond credibility that, moral and religious people will permit men, whom they have elevated by their votes to the highest places of dignity and trust, to disgrace themselves, their constituents, their country and the cause of liberty itself, by their beastly drunkenness in sight of the nation and of mankind, without at least putting forth an earnest effort to so modify our constitutions and laws, as forever to exclude the drunkard from all participation in the government, whether in the executive chair, in the halls of legislation, or at the polls. Would not this be prohibitory legislation, for the enactment and enforcement of which all sober and patriotic men could be united?

Nor would it be difficult to show that there are other sins against society, which ought to be held to disqualify one for the enjoyment of the elective franchise.

4. *Some such personal independence as will afford a degree of assurance that the vote cast would represent individual judgment, instead of being a duplicate of some other vote.*

No conception of human society can be farther from the truth than that which regards it as consisting of a mere aggregation of equal units. Men may and do, in these days, construct political theories on this assumption. But no laws, no education, no philosophical opinions, can ever make society such in fact. There is an irresistible force in human nature itself, which constantly renders such a consti-

tution of society impossible, by forming several individuals into one social unit, and multiplying such social units, till almost all the individuals that make up the State, the nation are embraced in them. The same force in nature which propagates the species, creates the family, according to laws which man does not devise and enact, but which nature and nature's God dictate and appoint. The family is not an aggregation of equal units, and no legislation of man can ever make it so. Children are born in utter weakness, helplessness, and dependence. In the whole animal creation, there is no other such utter helplessness and dependence as that of the human infant upon its parents. And from this condition of helplessness and dependence both of body and mind, the child ultimately escapes only after many long years of growth, discipline and training. During all these years the child is necessarily dependent on the parents, for the most part, both for his physical and moral nurture. His opinions and his knowledge are dispensed by the same hand that feeds and clothes him. No one in his right senses thinks of making him a voter, till he has passed these years of pupilage. It is not merely want of intelligence which excludes minors from the ballot—it is want of independence. To give the ballot to minor children would be, for the most part, to give each father as many additional ballots as he has minor children. No one has ever suggested that this would be wise or just.

Nor is this want of independence quite limited to the children of the family. We are well aware that to some the suggestion will be unpalatable, and be met with bitter scorn, that to a considerable extent, this dependence reaches the wife also. But we are writing to utter truth, and not to gratify the tastes of our readers. The question at issue is not a question of human contrivance, human devices, and human legislation, but of natural and divinely constituted law. Nature itself doth teach, that marriage is not an ordinary contract between equal partners; but a relation to

which the partners are moved by the impulses of nature within them; implying, on the one side, active responsibility, support and protection; on the other, loving trust and dependence. For the confirmation of this proposition, we may safely abandon all other witnesses, and appeal the case to the natural instincts of true womanhood. What true wife has not in her own heart the consciousness, that she was moved to accept the hand that was tendered her, not by the belief that she saw in that man one whom she was willing to accept as her equal partner, but one on whom she could safely lean for support and protection, with confiding trust and a loving sense of dependence? Whenever the real response of the wifely heart to this inquiry can be obtained, our question will be definitely decided by the voice of nature herself. We might appeal with equal confidence to the heart of every true man that ever entered into the married relation. As he was leading his bride to the altar, was it his feeling that that woman was to be his equal partner, as responsible for the success of their life-voyage as himself? Did he not feel an almost heart-sickening apprehension, that he might fail of making that being happy, who was at that moment so confidently committing her all to his care?

Men, and women too, may argue, as they will, for the equal partnership of domestic society; they will argue in vain. Those impulses of the human soul which render the family inevitable, are not impulses towards an equal partnership; but towards a union of two souls, in which the sentiments of the parties are characterized, not by equality, but by contrast, rendering the relation more tender, delightful and enduring than any feeling of equality could ever make it. In such a society, the woman's sense of trust and dependence is such, that she seldom stands related to the outside world as an independent unit. Her opinions of that outside world will, to a great extent, be formed by her husband, and correspond with his. A true husband and wife are, to the rest of mankind, a unit, not two inde-

pendent individuals. When that husband has deposited his ballot, that domestic society has voted. That woman could not be more perfectly represented by going in person to deposit her-own ballot. We might not be unwilling to admit that, the man who thus lives a true domestic life, might as safely be trusted with two votes as other men with one, but we can hardly expect that society at large would concede such a claim.

It is said that for those who are happily married this may do; but what of those who live unhappily? We answer, that what is set forth above is true marriage—nature's marriage, and for that society ought to legislate; and not for those who pervert and disgrace that sacred institution. The less you increase the influence of such persons or such families in the state, the better it will be for public liberty and public virtue. Again, we reply, that there are few, very few families in which the intention of nature is so far thwarted, that the wife does escape from this her natural dependence on her husband. Few married women ever sink so low as to acknowledge to themselves that their husbands are not to be trusted. Between husband and wife there may be many a conflict; but, as between her husband and all the rest of the world, the wife stands with her husband. This is nature; this is fact; whatever our theories may require: married women are not to be expected to be independent voters.

Perhaps it is said, this may be true in fact, but it is because women have been very badly educated; all this must be corrected by educating women to be independent. To this the answer is ready. Woman's feeling of dependence on man is not a product of education, but of nature. It is not a thing of the intellect, but of the heart. It is that great, God-made, permanent reality, *SEX*; and you cannot educate it out of her. And should you succeed, by a perverse construction of your systems of education, in educating it out of her, you would only abolish the family, and so fundamentally change the laws of nature, and the con-

stitution of society, that we should have no data left from which to predict the future of the human race.

It may be said: this only applies to women in families; what of the tens of thousands of the unmarried? The female sex are made for marriage, as well as the male sex. And the same structure of the female mind and heart remains, though marriage should not be actually contracted. The one great fact of sex pervades the whole animal kingdom, and you can, by no means, confine it within the limits of married life. That feeling of dependence on the other sex, which fits woman for her place and share in domestic society, is co-extensive with humanity, and will, always and everywhere, unfit woman to stand as an independent social unit. Exceptions there are—some of them very disgusting and shocking exceptions; but the rule will be found to have as few exceptions as any law of human nature which can be propounded in language.

There is a spirit abroad which will reject such views as these with indignant scorn, as disparaging to women. It is difficult to say whether the persons who so regard the subject are most fitly met by our pity or our stern rebuke. They have surely, through some fault or folly of their own, failed to see and to appreciate some of the most beautiful exhibitions of character ever given to man to witness in this world. That man or woman is certainly to be compassionated, who has not yet learned that dependence does not imply humiliation. One cannot help fearing, that such an one has not yet learned the import of those words of him who spake as never man spake, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of God." Have you never seen the child whose confiding trust and loving sense of dependence on her parents was entire and all pervading, and her obedience to every intimation of their wishes was as implicit as it was cheerful and joyous? And was your heart unmoved by the spectacle? Could you see no beauty in it? Did you regard her parents as tyrants, and the

beautiful and lovely child as humiliated and degraded? Confess the truth. Was it not difficult for you to decide, whether you most honored and revered those parents for thus training their child, or the child for thus reverencing and obeying such parents? The very trustfulness and loving consciousness of dependence which you saw in that child is an image of beauty and loveliness in your heart which will perish only with your memory. It was not humiliating and degrading, but dignified and ennobling.

No more is woman degraded and humiliated by her dependence. It is not only the ornament of her beauty, but the crown of her glory, and the scepter of her power. In all history there is no true, chivalrous heart-homage of man to woman, which does not assume and recognize that dependence of woman as the very citadel of her power over him. If woman will insist on abdicating that throne on which God has placed her, and coming down to the dead level of an equal partnership with man, she will be an infinite loser in the transaction. She will find herself a dethroned queen, having divested herself of the divinely given prerogatives of her womanhood, in a vain contest for equality with man; while in all those elements of power on which success in the rude competitions of life chiefly depends, she is vastly and hopelessly his inferior.

5. *The ballot should not be given to any, if any such there are, who owe to society other duties higher than those of the mere voter, for which duties they would be disqualified by the enjoyment and use of the elective franchise.*

The foreign ambassadors who are representing their country in other lands, the sailor on the ocean, in all ordinary cases the soldier at his post of duty, are discharging other duties for their country, for the sake of which they must forego the privilege of voting. May it not be reasonably doubted, whether woman can enjoy and use the elective franchise, without impairing her fitness for her peculiar function as the central orb around which the domestic system revolves? Can woman perform all the rough work, and

endure all the tough handling implied in an active participation in political life, without losing something of that delicacy of feeling and gentleness of spirit which fit her to fill and adorn her own place in the domestic circle? Can she canvass for office and be canvassed? Can she subject herself to the strain of forming an independent opinion on each political question which may arise, and maintaining it against all the sophistries of the disputant, and all the wiles of the demagogue, without sacrificing much of woman's gentleness and trustfulness, and substituting in its place much of the hardness and roughness of man's nature? Will she not be either a very poor politician, or else an unsexed woman?

Especially if she should differ in her political views from her husband, (and if this is not as likely as not to occur, there is surely no propriety in giving her the ballot), can any one seriously think that her activity in political life would tend to domestic tranquility? Is it really supposed that our virtue and happiness as a people would be promoted by introducing the bitterness of our political conflicts into the daily intercourse of every family in the land, around the table and the hearthstone? Is it well that political strife should mar the harmony of every marriage bed-chamber? Is it well, that, in times of high political excitement, he whose heart is torn and lacerated by the political conflicts that are everywhere abroad, should find no escape from them in his own house, or in the retirement of his chamber? Shall the wife of his bosom be his political antagonist—perhaps his rival candidate for office? Shall his children take sides, part for the father, and part for the mother? If we are to have any families and homes, must not one sex or the other withdraw from political conflicts?

It is even so. The social revolution now so persistently pressed upon our consideration involves the question, whether the family is to be preserved or abolished. Let the "Reform against Nature" be successful; bring woman

out of her seclusion and dependence, and make her, in fact as well as in theory, the equal competitor of man, on every arena of business, professional and official life, and the family becomes an impossibility. You can no more constitute the family of two such equal partners, than you can constitute it by uniting two men or two women in the marriage covenant. The forces, the beautiful dependencies and subordinations, which are nature's provision for making the family, will have been destroyed. When the family is thus rent asunder by political conflicts, it will cease to be.

To some, it seems that we need woman's purity, woman's virtue, at the polls. Is it not more obvious, that we are in so much greater need of all that is gentle, and beautiful, and lovely in woman, at home; that we cannot afford to subject her to all the rough handling of political and public life? It is sometimes claimed that woman is more virtuous, more conscientious than man. If she is so, it is because she lives a more sheltered and less tempted life. Let us not draw, or drive her from that sacred shelter; for facts of terrible frequency show, that she is quite capable of falling; and that when she falls, she is wont to sink to depths of degradation which man seldom knows, and of which he is scarcely capable. We do not want woman's vices, nor her weaknesses, nor her passions at the polls. If suffrage is extended to woman, and she participates in our politics as men do, we are sure to have them. That will be a dark day for American liberty.

These things have been said on the supposition that the ends aimed at by the present agitation can be actually accomplished. But let it not be supposed that our fears are greatly excited. Those aims are utterly impracticable. Change, if you must, the constitution and the laws, till not only the polls, but all the offices of the government shall be as accessible to woman as to man. Cast down every legal barrier; and the agitators will still be as far from accomplishing their purpose as ever. A few women will be drawn into the political arena, and only a few. The

great mass of American women are women indeed. They will still cherish the sacred subordinations of domestic life, and love the quietness of home, and leave political conflicts to their fathers, brothers, husbands. An agitation, which at one time seemed likely to revolutionize society from its deepest foundations, will only result in plunging a few men, and perhaps more women, into irremediable folly, and in proving at last how much stronger are these foundations of society which God has laid, than any human agitations are to subvert and destroy.

ARTICLE IV.

THE NEW ERA OF THE SPIRIT.

PERE HYACINTHE, in a letter to L. W. Bacon, quotes, as a symbol of the reunion of the several parts of the Church of Christ, these words from the Book of Ezekiel: "Thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, 'For Judah, and for the Children of Israel his companions;' then take another stick, and write upon it, 'For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel, his companions; and join them one to another into one stick, and they shall become one in thy hand.'" (xxxvii. 16, 17). He recognizes good in all the Christian denominations, and is ready to find the Church of Christ not exclusively in any one, but scattered through them all; and he seems to feel that he has a mission in causing the divided sheep of the fold to recognize one another, and come into relations of mutual fellowship and peace. After quoting these words from Ezekiel, he remarks: "To me, likewise, who am the least of Christains, in those spiritual visions which are ever vouchsafed to longing souls, the Lord hath spoken. He has placed in my hand these two sundered and withered branches, Rome and the children

of Israel who follow her; the churches of the Reformation and the nations that are with them. I have pressed them together on my heart, and under the outpouring of my tears and prayers I have so joined them, that henceforth they might make but one tree. But men have laughed to scorn my effort, seemingly so mad, and have asked of me, as of that ancient seer, 'Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these things?' And while I gaze on that trunk so bare and mutilated, even now I seem to see the brilliant blossom and the savory fruit: 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism.' 'And there shall be one flock and one Shepherd.'"

But I would appropriate the symbolical transaction of joining the sticks to a much larger and profounder movement than the one conducted by Father Hyacinthe, a new movement of the Divine Spirit, which bears him as a speck floating on the current, but the fullness and majesty of which penetrate all parts of Christendom.

In the different ages there has been a mysterious investment of the religious thinking and feeling of the Christian world as by an unseen Presence, bearing its own way and shaping its development. This invisible, guiding Breath — this unseen quickening Spirit, surrounding the special culture of the church, at signal periods, floating it, moulding it, conducts it whither it would. Men are strangely drawn by it into the mysterious drift. Individuality, originality, vigor, backed by learning and cultivation, when not in relation to the existing tidal movement, either as favoring or opposing it, have dropped as snow flakes, melted away and disappeared. Words, and deeds, and influence have had power, and been electrical only as they have sprung up out of it, and returned into it, helping it along; or have precipitated themselves against it, retarding or deflecting, but not arresting it. "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder."

In the age of the apostolic fathers, the encircling Breath

of the Almighty led Christians to feel chief interest in the simple facts and truths of the Gospel. To work these up into dogma, creed, exact definition, logical statement, science, they had no heart; and doing it would have had no hearing. Hence if there were such theologians at that time, it is not strange that their names have perished.

From the third to the sixth century, however, churchmen were defining and reducing to system the facts and truths of the Gospel, laboring for the exact form of Christian doctrines and institutions, and doing little else for the unfolding of Christianity, with a will. Beginning before the close of this period, and continuing to the Reformation, the next great movement was in the direction of ecclesiasticism; and he who was not in that or opposed to it, was as one born out of due time. The church, however, as is usual in such cases, that nothing may be lost, and to show the continuity and unity of the the divine plan, took with her into this special solicitude the choicest of the results of her previous training, a lingering fondness for the doctrine.

The movement which began with Luther, or, rather, was successfully ushered in in his time, was in the direction of individuality. The Bible, it is true, was made the standard; but the Bible, the Church, Christian institutions, everything was put in the hands of the individual for him to pronounce upon and use; and this was a sacred trust from God to his own reason and conscience, for the right exercise of which in this high adjudication he was to give account hereafter. Heaven's gracious economy was committed to the individual, and the reverse of the previous belief, when the individual was committed to the economy. Under the operation of the subtle, all-penetrating energy which was then investing Christian lands, developing the single mind, suggesting the themes to be discussed, and inspiring the mode of discussion, giving sympathetic words a preternatural life, and causing hostile words to excite the horror of daggers. The last three centuries have been pushing the principle of individuality out to its consequences. Every one has come to have

his own religious opinions, and to feel that these are the most sacred things, not to be compromised or yielded, but advocated and pushed, on pain of immortal penalties. Consequently it has been a period in which opposing different schools of theology have sprung up and at once plunged into controversy, sharp, crisp, snappish, and in which the schools have been indefinitely subdivided. Sects have multiplied, and been eager and sometimes furious, each taking sight along its own hair-line; and, besides the open, pronounced sects, the members of which have in some way succeeded in coming under a common banner; there are thousands of persons who are themselves to be considered separately — so many infinitesimal sects who, not finding any church that exactly squares with their notions, nor enough persons who agree with them to form an independent organization, live apart as ecclesiastical free-booters. In civil affairs this tendency has led to the assertion of human rights and the principles of free government, and given great stimulus to personal activity, growth and culture. Many forms of the application of this tendency have been most beneficent; but the principle is beginning to be pushed to an extreme. We have begun to sacrifice the social principle to it, as if society were of small account and individuals everything; or as if society would take care of itself, if rights enough are given to the individual.

Now these different directions in which the religious training of the church has been conducted by the invisible Guide, however apparently inconsistent with one another, or with those that are to follow, are not really so, nor are they inconsistent with the great end. They are all steps forward towards the grand result, necessary parts of the symmetrical and complete training of the church. When the end is reached, it will be apparent that nothing has been lost, that the whole development has been under the control of the Master Mind, and has been straight forward; and also that the church takes with her into each new form of her life the advantages she has acquired in the previous forms.

But, as already intimated, there are symptoms that the gracious Presence as it influences us is changing its direction, and is bearing the Christian world towards union. The scattered fragments of the Body of Christ are showing a tendency to come together again, part to its part. Adjacent and kindred parts show this most, yet the influence of a centralizing attraction is noticeably affecting them all.

As is usual when the Spirit of God invests the minds of men with one of these vital currents, there is now a remarkable plasticity to Christian sympathy and opinion in this direction. Prejudices, hostilities, acidities, separating the sects, are strangely dissolving. Sectarian words, appeals, movements, blasts, somehow cease to stir the heart as a war-trumpet. He who tries to ring again the changes on these themes finds no general audience. The popular religious heart has another want, and has passed out into another religion. The "thoughts that breathe, and words that burn," are those of fraternity, unity, peace, catholicity. Electrical messages of this sort are passed back and forth, especially between kindred bodies, as the different branches of the Presbyterian family, those of the Methodist family, between Congregationalists and Baptists, and between all evangelical Episcopalians and other denominations, as also between Unitarians and Universalists, and a certain school of churchmen in the Anglican, Romish and Greek churches; and there are no words in our day more significant. We are living apparently in the beginning of a silent ecclesiastical revolution. We have seen the great movement in the direction of individuality — the dissipation of church life into molecules, into spray, still, for the most part, in groups, as the water of the sea when evaporated hangs and floats in the air in clouds. A new sight dawns. These separated particles are beginning to run together, particle to particle, drop to drop, cloud to cloud, and then stream to stream; and there are indications which raise the question whether these streams may not be starting towards one great sea again. This is the new era of the Spirit's working on which we are entering.

It is in accordance with this new era — to usher it in, or help it on, or seal it — that the gracious working in conversion has already begun to be mostly on the basis of the facts of the gospel, rather than on that of doctrine. Old men have remarked this, and been troubled by it. The former apparatus of conversion, a sharp and bristling array of doctrines, and the soul running the gauntlet in a painful experience through them, seems to be strangely set aside by the Holy Ghost; and children, youth, adults, even, pass quietly into the kingdom on a simple acceptance of the facts of the Gospel. Formerly the Spirit chose to quicken and renew the soul — just as he was training and educating the church — by means of a keen and vigorous handling of the accepted creeds. Grace came at the points of theology — Calvinistic theology, Armenian theology, no matter. It was the individual mind coming up to God, the Saviour, along its acute convictions of Christian truth and doctrine. Now, there are few renewals in this way. They are on a broader basis, a basis common to the evangelical denominations, a basis appealing not so much to the thinking individuality as the believing spirit and yielding heart.

In full agreement with this, Christian experience also is run in a more smooth and catholic mould of doctrine than formerly. The special denominational crimp is not so visible. If you hear a stranger speaking in prayer meeting, it is not at once apparent whether his pedigree were from the Puritan, Wesleyan, or Episcopal stem; you see mainly that he is of the family of Christ. His experience no longer climbs up along the denominational trellis, but has thrown itself upon Jesus as its support and grows along him. The provincialisms of piety, therefore, which we used to hear are making room for catholic words, which go through all Christian hearts alike.

Moreover, the change of which I am speaking is quite noticeable in Christian literature. The denominational press must breathe quite an undenominational air, or it is

felt to be a burden and a sore to the denomination. The books which form the staple of the publications of the ecclesiastical boards are selected from the general field, or adapted to enter it, or they meet with little demand. And writers connected with one part of the church are now and then, are often, seen lifting their heads so that they can look over their own enclosures and are heard speaking generous things of and to their neighbors. We sometimes hear these words from an unexpected quarter. Manning, the Romish Archbishop of Westminster, says: "The working of grace in the Church of England is a truth we joyfully hold and always teach. But we as joyfully recognize the working of the Holy Spirit among Dissenters of every kind. Indeed, I must say, that I am far more able to assure myself of the invincible ignorance of Dissenters as a mass, than of Anglicans as a mass. They are far more deprived of what survived the Catholic truth; far more distant from the idea of a church; far more traditionally opposed to it by the prejudice of education; I must add, for the most part, far more simple in their belief in the person and passion of our Divine Lord. Their piety is more like the personal service of disciples to a personal Master than the Anglican piety which has always been more dim and distant from this central light of souls. * * With truth, then, I can say that I rejoice in all the operations of the Holy Spirit out of the Catholic Church, whether in the Anglican or other Protestant bodies." (Quoted in *The Eccles.*, vol. vi., p. 373).

Individuals may lament the fact, but the age of narrow writing is passed. Sectarian text-books for popular reading are dead. Sectarian versions are dead. There is even a noticeable modification in the forms of doctrinal statement, where new forms are drawn up, from the more specific theology of special schools to a more general statement, acceptable to the mass of Christians. Late church creeds show this tendency. And whether the new or old phraseology prevails, the handling of the articles at the ex-

amination of candidates for church membership or the ministry, or the professorial chair is of a more general and fundamental character. No church or ecclesiastical judicature now thinks that its vital point, the seat of its life, is in the peculiarity of its creed. Dogmatically, the faith is still held to be essential; but this essential faith has shifted from the narrow denominational ground towards the common grounds occupied by the general family of Christ.

I am not describing what ought to be, or what is best to be, but what is. I am noting a great change which is taking place and recording itself in religious literature.

But of this tendency of the severed parts towards one another we have more extended and permanent symptoms.

Premonitory movements have been going on for years. The American Bible Society, instituted in 1808; the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in 1810; the New England, afterwards the American, Tract Society, in 1814; The American Sunday-school Union, in 1823; the American Home Missionary Society, consolidated from several smaller societies, in 1826; the American Seaman's Friend Society, in 1827; the Foreign Evangelical Society, in 1839; the Evangelical Alliance, in 1846, these,—to say nothing of many other societies, having a religious object,—have all been outside of the denominations as such, but have drawn them into fellowship at practical points, and are indicative of some deeper principle of common life beneath them, prophetic of the new era of the Spirit. Of a similar import also are the Young Men's Christian Associations, the Business Men's Daily Prayer Meetings, the great Laymen's Revival, of 1858, and the Christian Commission during the war,—the working energy of Christianity showing itself in these to be larger than sect or party, and refusing to confine its gifts longer to such channels.

Of still greater significance is the process of formal union which has actually begun. The two larger Presbyterian bodies, after a separation of thirty-one years, begun in acrimony, but gradually changing its tone, have run into each

others arms in sweet love, to be no more "twain but one flesh." The other branches of the same stock are suing for admission to the family. The divided Methodists are talking of union, and such conference in these times is prophecy. Already the suggestion has been made that there is nothing important in principle, certainly nothing vital to Christianity, to keep Congregationalists and Baptists permanently apart—a fact which is itself a first step towards union. Symptoms of enlargement of feeling are palpable. Indeed, a partial, perhaps a prophetic, illustration of the way in which a church may struggle out of its denominational lines towards the Church of the future, possibly hinting also the polity best adapted for this on account of its expansibility and flexibility, may be seen in the fact that, now and then, a Congregational church in calling a council has interpreted the fellowship of the churches as including the other christian denominations as well as its own, and invited them to sit in council with it. A late instance of this was at the recognition of the Mayflower Church in St. Louis, at which a council was invited composed of the pastors and delegates of the Congregational churches in the city, and of pastors and laymen of Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian churches, and at which Rev. Dr. S. J. Niccoll, pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, moved, "That we recognize this Church as a Church of Christ."

These are some of the facts and signs heralding the movement. They are as yet, however, but the tentative efforts of Christendom at union.

It is true there have been, and are, facts of a different character. There are still, and for this very reason, sectarian spasms. No great movement of the Spirit bears all along with it uniformly; many even are aroused into opposition by it. There are the turbulent, and the rebellious, and the frightened, as well as the docile and sympathetic. And it often happens, when a movement in opposition to the leading influence of the Spirit of God is aroused, that it is left to rush through its fatal course with fearful facility.

This was the case with Slavery. When it found itself arrayed against the spirit of the age, it rushed headlong through its inevitable logic, becoming more arrogant and defiant, down to destruction. So the very arrogancy and precipitancy of some of the late forms of sectarianism indicate that they stand over against the mighty working of the Holy Spirit in our time, and that they are left to rush rapidly through their career and find early dissolution. But it is noticeable that outside of narrow circles these sectarian agonies have been powerless. They have had no kindling effect, no radiating influence. It would seem as if some spiritual instinct or presentiment held men back from entering into alliance with an ecclesiastical death-agony. The exceptional facts, therefore, are so few and of such a sort that they do not disturb the significance of the signs of a great movement of the Spirit towards union.

But are we to suppose that the movement will stop where it is? Is it now any more than in its beginning?

A preparation has been made for much greater progress, surely. Under the late form of the manifestation of the Spirit, the development of individuality has probably reached its highest and most blessed results till the social principle is again asserted and vindicated. It has ripened and gone to seed, done its best,—and done its last, unless it is permitted to break down into anarchy,—mere irreducible, atomic, independency, which is at once ecclesiastical and social ruin. God, I believe, having carried the training of Christendom as far as desirable in that direction, is now moving to avert so dire a calamity, and to mass or unify the ripened vigor of individual culture already gained for the higher common uses of His kingdom, and so make a Church at once strong in its membership and one in its internal relations.

Christians, also of many names, are beginning to long for union. The divisive tendency of individuality is beginning to awaken anxiety, as well as excite pain by the scandal of the sight. As long as it merely threw off griev-

ances, and secured rights, and developed manhood, it met the want of the Church and the world and commanded admiration ; but when, having accomplished this, its mission, it begins to atomize, to dissolve the very texture of society and the social principles, it excites alarm, if not revulsion. The time has been when a man who made a proposition for a new sect, and offered himself as the leader of a new religious movement, would have been welcomed by multitudes as a messenger from Heaven. Now he is simply a "voice of one crying in the wilderness," a voice, and nothing more — a forerunner without followers. It is a hard time for persons with new commissions. They shrivel and die like plants in a desert. The members of the several denominations are, also, becoming tired of firing their sectarian guns. They are familiar with the sound of the different pieces that can be brought into the field, large and small. They have exhausted their argument, their logic, their invective, their wit. They are like two combatants who have fought one another till they have become tired of it, and as neither is ready to give up, have found out that there is nothing worth fighting about, and concluded to stop and be friends. Hence, laying aside their sectarian arms, they seek other employment.

Such employment invites them — outside employment, common work that naturally draws them more closely together. The world is now thrown open to them and invites them, for the first time, to come and occupy it for Christ. Contrasted with Paganism, all forms of true Christianity are one, and the missionary spirit, now so largely educating Christians, is educating them to forget their differences.

There are common foes, also, nearer at hand, that are crowding them into closer array. The Christian faith was never stronger than now ; never dearer to believing hearts ; never more thoroughly intrenched and buttressed in reason ; never more vital and aggressive. But the foes with which it has to contend no longer assail it in particulars and ex-

ternals, but seek to subtract from it and destroy its very foundations—all the possibilities of its truth. Hence, thoughtful Christians, seeing that the forms of popular unbelief are so subtle and fundamentally destructive, feel that they had better turn their attention jointly to saving the citadel than wrangle about the relative value of their particular apartments. The live questions of the day are not between the denominations, but between them and the outside unbelief—not what version of the scripture is best, but whether we have any Bible; not concerning the nature of decrees, but whether there is a personal God to decree; not in relation to ability and inability, but whether man has a spiritual and responsible nature at all; not about the quality or essence of virtue, but whether there is any such thing as virtue; not whether the few or many are saved, but whether man has a soul to be saved at all. The whole doctrine of theism and of spiritual existence is assailed, with all its logical and moral consequences and uses, as the difference between right and wrong, the accountability of man, and the immortality of the soul—all religion, all morality. Christianity is tried in all its strongholds, in all its fundamentals, in Christian lands, and this not by a few loathed infidels, but by popular writers and speakers, and in popular circles. The vitals of every sect are threatened on every hand, in the popular lecture, the widely circulated and read periodical, in polite letters, philosophies of nature, and tractates on science and art. It is not strange, under these circumstances, that denominational differences begin to look small. When the life of a nation is threatened, those who love it, forget party and rush to its protection; so, now, when the most fundamental, the most insidious, the most fatal of all the assaults ever made on Christianity are pressing it sore on every side, its friends are beginning to feel, as they have never before felt since the Reformation, that they must close up, and stand shoulder to shoulder, and fight for the common cause; and that there is no reason why they should not do it.

Under such training, with the breath of the Almighty inspiring and guiding it, the process of reducing and weakening the thickness and height of the partition walls is going rapidly on. The same ecclesiastical shell may remain, the same denominational routine be kept up, the same formulas and standards be preserved; yet these things are no longer cold, rigid, massive bulks of separation — forts shotted with jealousy and defiance, but are changing to fitting and graceful badges distinguishing friendly and allied powers. We are nearing the time when the great distinction will be whether one is on the side of Christ or against him, and when, as compared with this, all other distinctions will be nothing.

Now, with this beginning already made, and this preparation for further progress, whither will the Spirit take us? Into a new church of the future, to rise in beauty and glory out of all the churches of the present, but unlike any one of them? or will he draw all the others into one of the existing powerful, ecclesiastical strongholds? or does he design to make the union moral only, not ecclesiastical — a union in love, sympathy, co-operation? I think that something more than the last will be the issue, but hardly the second, as ecclesiasticism, the principle of our compact and closely articulated church has been tried and failed, and certainly no one of the existing ecclesiastical systems has capacity enough to absorb the others without undergoing itself essential modification and internal revolution. My opinion inclines rather to the first supposition.

It may be easier for us, however, to anticipate the process of Christian union in the future, than the result. The process of uniting kindred bodies, already begun, will be likely to continue for some time. There are several distinct crystalizing centres towards which the principle of affinity seems to be drawing these kindred bodies. The hierarchical principle is attracting the hierarchical bodies; the democratic principal the democratic denominations; and the representative, or graded principle, the advocates

of a mixed system. It is barely possible that for an indefinite time the church of the future may crystalize around these three ideas. But, contemplating this movement in its origin and its profounder relations as the work of the Holy Spirit, seeing it as penetrating and sweeping through the whole church, and bearing all Christians towards one another, in the one kingdom of God, we can not suppose that it will take a threefold direction as a finality, and that the church of the future will rest on three irreducible ecclesiastical ideas, one branch ending in a hierarchical, one in a democratic, and one in a mixed system. Rather, we should suppose, that these three forms would be but stages of temporary rest as the scattered fragments advance towards one another, to find, ultimately, some more fundamental and vital union. In coming together it is quite natural that the weary flocks, traveling from afar, should seek to refresh themselves for a while in such transient folds. But, in as far as the Holy Spirit is in the movement, He will not suffer them to stop there.

And as far as He is in it, too, we may be assured that the movement will not be in the direction of those systems which are encumbered by human complications and additions, ultimately. The ultimate church will be a comparatively spiritual church, with simple machinery, simple organization — held together and animated, not by man's work, but by the presence and power of the Spirit of God.

What, exactly, the ultimate polity will be when reached, it is impossible to say, nor shall I conjecture further than I have done the polity best adapted to lead to it. But I imagine that when reached, its working will admit of great flexibility and adaptation to localities and circumstances, while binding the parts together in strong, fraternal and spiritual bonds; autonomy of parts, and unity in will and work in the whole. Then will be fulfilled the prayer, "That thy all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they all may be one in us."

It is a sublime consummation — a building not made

with hands, the end towards which the ages have been toiling—for God has been pleased to bring out and work up the idea of the church slowly—here a contribution and there a contribution, in one age one principle, in another, another. The world, as yet, has seen only a fragmentary church; and men have been worried and baffled at the sight, not understanding the divine method, and supposing that they had the true idea of the church, instead of some crude preliminary approaches towards it. But this church of the future will gather up all these fragments, the contributions of the different dispensations and eras of the Spirit, in one glorious whole. Then the world will look on a spectacle of transcendent beauty, worthy of the ages required to perfect it. Then there will be no need of apologizing for sects as if they were a good in themselves and an end, instead of a transient stage towards a higher good. Then, as never before, the church will look “forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.”

This result, or any other like it, I do not look for in a day. God has chosen to occupy ages in investing the church with his ideas. How many centuries was He in eradicating the tendency to idolatry in the ancient church! How many in aiding Christians to work up the facts and truths of the Gospel to a doctrinal system—a system not yet thoroughly elaborated, so many and vast the particulars to be brought into it! How many in arousing the individual to a knowledge and use of himself! and how many he may now occupy in bringing these intensely individualized Christians into harmonious and peaceful relations, the mighty church of the future! And yet, when the special influence of the Almighty acts on the thinking and feeling of great communities, to turn them in a particular direction, opinions and sympathies sometimes change very rapidly. What a change in political notions we have seen sweep as an avalanche through a nation! It is not safe to enter into a calculation to show how long it will take the

Spirit of God to prepare the religious sentiment of the world so that the wolf and the lamb may feed together. Social thinking is in itself a mystery, and moves in strange waves; and sometimes the waves rush forward with wonderful velocity. And a movement of this kind, when borne on by the all-encompassing influence of Jehovah, may reach astonishing results soon. This, however, will be simply as the Lord wills. If His purposes are ready for it; if He wants a united church; if His time has come to have Christian people stand side by side, we shall see the remaining obstacles to Christian union melt away, and Christians of many names swiftly unite in one true, loving brotherhood, and so go up and possess the world. The Lord hasten it in His time.

ARTICLE V.

THE ROMISH WAR UPON AMERICAN SCHOOLS.

" Catholics would not be satisfied with the public schools, even if the Protestant Bible and every vestige of religious teaching were banished from them."

" The Catholic solution of this muddle about Bible or no Bible in schools, is 'hands off.' No state taxation or donations for any schools."

" This subject (of the public schools) contains in it the whole question of the progress and triumph of the Catholic Church in the next generation in this country."*

THERE can be no question that the Puritan has at last outwitted the Jesuit! In the long contest between these chief champions of Christianity, on the one hand, and of the semi-Pagan system called Romanism on the other, the Puritan has often triumphed by hard fighting, while the Jesuit has been the acknowledged master of all the arts of indirection. It is consequently both encouraging and amus-

* Extracts from the *Freeman's Journal* and other Romish authorities in the *Christian World* February, 1870.

ing to notice the consternation, evinced in the above extracts, at the discovery that the New England system of free schools, though not a deceit, or a fraud, or a falsehood, is yet more deftly sagacious than any deceit, fraud, or falsehood ever invented by the masters of Catholic finesse. The free school system has long been understood by Protestants to be not only a direct movement upon ignorance, but, incidentally, a flank movement upon Romanism, sure, in the process of time, to turn its position and put it to utter rout. A church which teaches that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," has little to hope, and much to fear, from schools which teach science, but exclude the catechism. A church which requires unquestioning faith, can have little complacency in schools which cultivate an incisive, analytic, dominant reason, which demands proof as imperiously from a Pope as from a Professor.

A church which is compelled, for self-preservation, to insist that history shall take the black veil and bury itself from the knowledge of the world, so that the long record of a career of crime and pollution, unmatched in shamelessness, may be withdrawn from the memory of men, is not likely to be pleased with the daily drill of the public school in the annals of colonization in the United States or of the English Commonwealth, or of the "Bloody Mary," or of the French Huguenots. A church which is confessedly aiming at complete political power in this land, and at the union of church and state under some worn-out Italian cardinal in Rome, cannot willingly tolerate a system of instruction which makes independent voters as well as independent thinkers. A church which dreads the Bible in the hands of an educated people as its worst foe, cannot be expected to display a very enthusiastic interest in schools, in which the Bible is read, or in which children are trained to read the Bible.

The Puritan, therefore, in devising the system of common schools, for the education of the intellect, has placed an insurmountable obstacle in the way of Romish suprem-

acy in this country. If the Catholic children attend the schools they will soon become very poor Catholics, and will eventually cease to be Catholics at all. This will be the result simply of *mental* training, whether any religious instruction be given or not. If, on the other hand, the Catholic children are withdrawn from the schools, and are gathered into Papal schools and colleges, under the superficial and incomplete instruction which alone is compatible with their continued endurance of priestly control, then they are doomed to be forever hewers of wood and drawers of water, for the educated population among them. Knowledge is power, and mental discipline is still more emphatically power. There is no hope for Papal supremacy in this country, but in the total destruction of the common school systems both for Catholics and Protestants. Under any system which shall educate Catholics in the Roman style and Protestants in the Puritan style, the Protestants will remain dominant in position, wealth and influence, while the Catholic will remain, as now, the Pariah caste of America. Skepticism may flourish amid public schools. Catholicism can only wither. Skepticism, from the mildest form of "liberalism" to the rankest form of atheism, is the result of a partially awakened mental activity and of that "little learning" which is proverbially a "dangerous thing." A Romanist, educated in science and philosophy, and in the ancient tongues, after the fashion of the American college, may become a rationalist, but he will not, unless in a few exceptional cases, remain a Romanist. The common school may promote Christianity or infidelity, according as it is, or is not, supplemented by a strong religious influence. But a religion of dogma, of tradition, of blind, senseless resistance to human progress, cannot live within its range. All this, which has been perfectly well understood by this Protestant nation from the first, seems to have dawned at last upon the duller intellects of our Romish fellow citizens, and to have awakened them, in a very unpleasant way, from their dream of a speedy supremacy

in the land. As might be expected, they are very much excited. As might also be expected, *they are determined to destroy our schools*. It is sheer folly to imagine that they mean anything else. Nothing else will answer their purpose, which is to remove our capital, not to the Mississippi valley, but to Rome. Nothing else, in fact, will save Romanism from a gradual but sure extinction in the United States. They will fight against popular unsectarian education with the energy of despair. It is a question with them of life or death.

WHAT IS THE REAL QUESTION? The question, then, which we have to consider is simply this: On what ground can we best meet this assault upon our public schools? What principle or policy will rally the largest number of our people to sustain our public schools, as the instrument simply of mental education? The question is constantly stated otherwise, and the statement is misleading and dangerous. It is constantly asked, "*How can we satisfy the Catholics?*" Shall we use the Douay version of the Bible, or give Catholic children a separate chapel, furnished with crucifixes and Madonnas, where they can count their beads and say their prayers every morning, or shall we simply insist on the repetition of the ten commandments, omitting *the second*, and of the Lord's Prayer, omitting the closing ascriptions, or shall we exclude both the Bible and God as "sectarian," and proceed to expurgate all school literature, and science, and philosophy, of every religious thought and reference, or shall we divide the public money with the Catholics in the proportion of the taxes paid by each, or shall Protestants be taxed to support Catholic schools, on the basis of attendance? Which one of these measures will satisfy the Papists?

The answer is, NOT ONE OF THEM — and this for the simple reason that, prejudicial as some of them would be to Protestantism, and grossly unjust as most of them are, and sure as some of them would be to provoke resistance, even unto blood, from multitudes whose most sacred convictions

would be trampled upon, still, not one of them would give to Papists the supremacy they seek, or save them from the extinction to which they are doomed. The more sagacious among them might professedly accept any one or all these propositions, and temporarily cease their clamor. But they will be quiet only on the supposition that these concessions are stepping-stones to a throne of absolute power, near at hand. The less sagacious, or the less bigoted among them, might more sincerely and cordially accept some compromise of this sort. But they would soon cease to be satisfied, and commence "asking for more," or they would be pushed on by their ecclesiastics to make new demands.

The American people must come to look the real issue squarely in the face. In the very nature of the case, nothing can satisfy Romanists, or terminate their assaults upon our schools, but the overthrow of the whole system, both for Protestants and Catholics. Separate schools doom the Catholic to everlasting inferiority; united schools, though every possible concession be made, will eventually extinguish all that is peculiar to Romanism as a religion of prescription, of dogma, and of blind faith. Free schools may raise up Fenelons and Hyacinthes; but they will pinch, in the germ, the whole brood of Loyolas and Antonellis. Free schools might endure the Catholicism of France; but they would extinguish the ultramontaniam of Italy. Free schools might turn off beads and amulets and holy water with a smile of indifferent tolerance, but the *priests*, who thrust their wooden superstitions into the very temples of learning, who enthrone their silly miracles above the laws of science, who demand that history itself shall be turned into a lie, will be most unceremoniously ejected.

We must, then, throw the Romanists entirely out of the account in our settlement of the question, *Shall the Bible be excluded from our schools?* The only question is, What course will commend itself to our non-Catholic population as on the whole just, fair, tolerant, and consistent with the principles of religious liberty which lie at the foundation of our government.

WHAT ARE THE AMERICAN PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY? At this point we encounter some vagueness in the minds of our people, which needs to be removed before we shall show a firm and undivided front in resistance to the assault now made upon our schools.

1. It is evident that the American principle of religious toleration includes the *recognition of God*. The nation had its birth in an act of solemn prayer, the adoption of the Declaration of Independence being preceded by a united and tearful appeal to the Most High by the Congress, in which the Puritan and the Catholic, the Free Thinker and the Episcopalian, knelt side by side, and invoked the blessing of *the God of Christianity*. The Congress has ever since opened every session of both Houses with prayer to God; our Presidents have been inaugurated with prayer; our Courts and Legislatures have sought wisdom in prayer; days of prayer and praise have been proclaimed by the National Government and by every State Government; the appeal to God by the oath is prescribed by law, and the "taking of God's name in vain," by perjury, is punished by the laws of the land. To all this distinct and solemn recognition of God, not a word of objection has been heard. By common consent, by constant usages, by constitutional and statutory enactment, it has been decided that no religious toleration is admitted by this government, which excludes the full recognition of the God of Christianity as the object of fear and of worship, in all governmental institutions and assemblies.

If, then, the Chinese, or the Atheist, or the Pantheist, who does not believe in the God of Christianity, shall claim that all recognition of the Deity, whether by prayer or by oath, shall cease wherever he is compelled to pay taxes, in order that his conscience may not be violated, the answer of this Government and of this nation is clear and decided. No, sir! The American principle is that the recognition and fear of God are *essential to the existence of civil society*. Our toleration of men's consciences does not go to the point of self-

destruction. We will respect your conscientious convictions *until they imperil the existence of the State.* But when the question is, whether your conscience shall be respected or the State be destroyed, then your conscience must yield.

Now if the proposition be made to the Papist, We will yield the reading of the Bible to your professed scruples, but we insist on retaining *God*, by the use of the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, and he refuses, as *he certainly will*, to accept the proposition, and declares that he can not conscientiously pay a tax to such a school, we have only to say, as we do to the Buddhist or the Atheist, "You have now pressed us to the utmost limits of the religious toleration sanctioned by the principles and usages of this government. To go another step to meet you, will be to endanger the public safety, and to imperil the very existence of our civil institutions.

Here is firm ground. The American people will stand here, clear in the conviction that the principle of religious liberty is saved while civil liberty is secured.

2. It is evident that the American principle of religious toleration includes the recognition of the *authority* of God. The oath is an appeal to God as the rewarder and punisher of human actions. Our whole system of legislation is founded upon the law of God as written in the conscience and as revealed in the constitution and needs of human society. No man is fitted to be a citizen, to give testimony in a court of justice, or to swear to a legal instrument, or to qualify for holding office, or to make or interpret the laws, or even to vote intelligently at the polls, who does not admit the supremacy of God as a governor, and who does not understand, in general at least, the nature of right and wrong in human action. The only reason why this principle is not carried out, as it formerly was, in the disfranchisement of atheists, is that there is so much doubt whether any real atheism is to be found, and to the general conviction that whatever men's speculations may be, they all tremble before the God of the Bible.

Here also is firm ground upon which the American people will stand unitedly in opposition to Freethinkers, Catholics and Pagans. The God of Christianity must be recognized in our public schools as a *law-giver*, and the nature of the law he has given, so far as it applies to human society, must be taught to all the children of this republic. If any man claims that his conscience is violated by paying taxes for such a purpose, we reply, "It cannot be helped. Self-preservation is the first law of the state. The state can tolerate no religious opinions which will destroy the sacredness of an oath or the authority of conscience. If civil statutes alone are to be the basis of obligation, and civil penalties alone are to deter men from crime, then no government is possible, but a government of force. Democracy must give way to a military despotism. A Russian or a Chinese empire must supplant the republic. In the name of liberty, then, we refuse you the liberty to destroy our liberty! We demand taxes of you for the support of no religious truth, however important, which is not *essential to the very existence of the State*. But the recognition of God as a law-giver and as the judge of men, is thus essential, and if you do not like it, you must go to some pagan land, where men can say, "There is no God," without peril to the State.

SHALL THE BIBLE BE EXCLUDED? These premises and principles being settled, we can readily come to an agreement concerning the simple matter of reading the Bible daily in the public schools.

On the one hand those who most strongly desire the continuance of that *special mode* of bringing God and his law before the minds of the children, will acknowledge that it is not the *only* mode of doing that essential work. The offering of a devout prayer—of the Lord's prayer for example, the reading of the ten commandments or of our Saviour's summary, and especially the construction of text books upon the principles of the Bible, the teaching of history as a plan of God, the permeating of the whole school literature and life with the spirit of Christianity,

would fully and effectually accomplish the object, without the direct reading of the Bible. If the Bible were the real object of attack, and if its removal would satisfy these tender consciences, which are now making such an outcry, and bring all classes to the cordial support of the public schools, then we might well enough yield the point. It is this *abstract* question which has been decided in the affirmative by some of our best Christian writers. The admission, however, proceeds upon a pure hypothesis. *If* we can retain the recognition of God and his law, *if* our school teachers and teaching can be thoroughly Christian, and *if* Catholics and Infidels and Pagans are all going to be satisfied and cease their hostility to the schools, *then*,—why THEN, we might safely consent to almost anything! We might agree to give up the Bible, or to read the Douay version, or to use the Latin Vulgate and teach the scholars Latin enough to understand it, which would be altogether an admirable thing to do, or we could have a selection from the Bible and the Papal Bulls, and, in California, from Confucius, adding a few choice bits from Tom Paine in localities where pious adherents to the peculiar sentiments of that sage are found, and let the children decide for themselves what to think of the Bible, thus put side by side with human nonsense. There would be very little danger in any concessions we might make, so long as our schools were not "*godless*," so long as history and science were not falsified, so long as genuineness and not Jesuitism presided in all the departments of instruction.

NOTHING GAINED BY EXCLUDING THE BIBLE.—But who does not see that no such concession would touch the question at issue? What the Catholics want is *to destroy the schools*, not to exclude the Bible. If they could have their choice they would sooner exclude the spelling book than the Bible, because that would injure the schools more. They would gladly exchange the cry of "*godless*" for "*grammarless*," if the apostles of the "*new education*" would carry their reforms to the exclusion of the study of

the English, as well as of the ancient languages. If we should yield the Bible, we should simply imitate the silly traveller who surrendered his horse to the highwayman to save his pistol, and then gave up his pistol to save his purse, and then offered his purse to save his clothes, and then stripped off his clothes to escape a beating, and finally ended his "compromises," half pounded to death, in a filthy ditch. The Papists will have to sharpen their wits on something more gritty than French and Music and the Catechism before they will be able to outwit "the universal Yankee nation" in a bargain of that sort. The fatuity exhibited in making the avowals which stand at the head of this article is a sufficient assurance that we are dealing in this matter with a horde of dull, untrained, ignorant men, whose whole power lies in the fact that shrewd Democratic politicians, who are in reality supplying all the brains in this movement, can get votes by operating upon their prejudices. When the busy people of this country shall take time enough to see what these foreign priests are trying to do, they will quickly send the politicians to the rear, and the battle will end in a rout!

MUCH WILL BE LOST BY EXCLUDING THE BIBLE.—Since, therefore, it is clear that we shall gain neither safety nor permanent quiet for our public schools by surrendering the Bible, all positive motive for the innovation is taken away. The additional question now comes up, Shall we not actually lose ground in this contest with the Romanists by making the concession? That such will be the result, can, we think, be made plain.

In the first place, it will give the Romanists a much more effective war-cry against the schools than they have now. Now they call them *sectarian*, and, though the charge is false, the American people are looking into the matter with a good deal of care to see if there may not be some foundation for it.

But exclude the Bible, and they will raise the cry of "godless schools," and do it to some purpose. They do it

even now. But as people have found that it means only that the priest and the catechism are shut out, they simply laugh at the absurdity. But let the Bible be removed, and it would soon come to be felt that the charge is too true. You would enlarge the number of discontents by a great accession from the Protestant population. While the Catholics would remain as hostile as ever, multitudes of sober, pious, sensible people would join them in open hostility, or aid them by an entire lack of interest in a system which they can not approve.

In the *second* place, we must put the manifest fact that we could not *logically stop with the exclusion of the Bible*.

Having admitted that nothing is to be allowed in the public schools which any tax payer can object to on the score of conscience, whether it be essential to the State or not, we must proceed to exclude all religious and moral matter of every kind. The hymns, with the sweet music the children love so much, would go first, as they have in Cincinnati, and the schools would become as dry and dull as they were forty years ago, when the crack of the ferule and the shrieks of poor tortured victims of an unskillful government, supplied the only interludes between the dreary hours of school. Next, the reading books would be overhauled, and every green and beautiful thing in poetry, or eloquence, or narrative which could be called "religious," would be carefully plucked up by these eager destroyers.

Next, History would be taken in hand, and would be so falsified by omissions, if not by positive glosses, that no intelligent parent would consent to give it to his child as the basis of his future opinions.

Still more eagerly would Science, and Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy, be subjected to the process of elimination, until all positive truths, to which any wise or any foolish man could object, were erased, and the whole range of studies became valueless for very emptiness.

No man could tell where this conscientious expurgation

would end, if the principle that the individual conscience, and not the essential needs of the State, are to regulate the studies of the public schools. The conscience of the Christian would demand one thing; that of the Infidel the very opposite. The Chinese would conscientiously demand that the images of his ancestors stand upon the teacher's desk. The Romanist would set up images of the saints, and knock down the ancestors. One man would object to Geology because it is, in his opinion, infidel; another to the Classics, because they are licentious; a third to the science of Government because it favors a protective tariff, or opposes woman's natural right to vote. The result would be the speedy destruction of the schools.

The only principle upon which the public schools can stand is, that, whatever *is essential to the end they are expected to accomplish*, shall be enforced. What is to be held as thus essential must be decided, as all other public questions are, by the majority of legal voters governing the schools, after full and free discussion. To admit the opposite principle in regard to the Bible, would be to inaugurate conscience as a prince of anarchy, and to arm the sentiment of personal liberty against the liberties of the State.

In the *third* place, by excluding the Bible and its teachings, we exclude the only book which inculcates a perfect morality, the only book which contains a perfect philosophy of mind, of government and of history; the only book which contains the record of a perfect human life, the only book which reveals a perfect God, the only book which teaches with authority the nature of his government, with its laws, with its rewards and punishments, and with the history of its actual working for six thousand years, the only book which has been adequate to create civilization and to lift the nations which have studied it and believed it, from barbarism to the dominant position of great powers in the earth.

Let it be remembered, in considering this point, that the question is not whether this book shall be read five minutes

each day, but whether all its teachings, which are offensive to those who hate it shall be excluded. It is claimed that the *religion* of the Bible, as well as the Bible itself, must be silent in the schools. The expurgation must be complete and universal. The drear solitude of an Arctic atheism, the absolute nihility of a universe emptied of all religious thought, the intense silence of a creation in which is heard no voice of the Creator and no devout utterance of a creature,—such is the barren, lifeless region to which our children are to be banished during the most sympathetic and susceptible years of their lives; and all this that they may be educated in accordance with the principles of religious toleration!

It has long been the opinion of the wisest men among us that the next battle for the American Republic will be fought with Rome. The prophecy seems to be on the eve of fulfilment.

The same foe with whom our fathers contended is now striking at the nation's life. Success in this attack means the slaughter of liberty; it means the overthrow of republicanism; it means the quenching of the light of knowledge; it means the death of free thought; it means the halt of civilization; it means the uprooting of the kingdom of Christ in this land. It will be poor policy to change front in the face of such an enemy. Not one good reason can be assigned for so dangerous an experiment. Our position is just. It is logical. It is consistent with the principle of religious toleration, as that principle was held by our fathers, as it has been interpreted by our courts, and as it has been embodied in the usages of our government. Nothing can be gained by abandoning the principle. We have only to continue the contest as we have begun it, and the overthrow of Romanism will be as complete as has been the overthrow of slavery.

NOTE.—The recent decision of the Superior Court of Cincinnati, granting a perpetual injunction restraining the School Board from prohibiting the reading of the Bible in the Schools, sets this principle in a clear light.

It will be seen that the decision goes beyond our assertion, and declares that not only the recognition of God, but the recognition of the *Bible*, is justified by the Constitution and Laws, at least of the State of Ohio.

Judge Storer says :

The provision of the Constitution recognizes the existence of a Supreme Being, but gives no preference to sects. The protection it gives to religious worship we may well conclude is not intended to apply to those who, like the Athenians, worship an unknown God. It is the Christian religion that is recognized by the Constitution. The Legislature has sustained this view, by exempting the family Bible from execution ; by providing that each apprentice shall be provided with one ; that a Bible shall be in the hands of every inmate of a jail, penitentiary, or of reformatory institutions. All this is at the public expense, and it is now claimed that the Bible cannot be read in our common schools. Nay, more, our halls of legislation and our courts of justice are supplied with copies of the Bible, and it is only from the common schools that it is sought to be expelled—thus making them the only exception to the general recognition of the Bible as the exponent of religion and morality.

The lowest view we can take of the religion contemplated and recognized by the Constitution, is that which recognizes a Supreme Being, not a creature of the imagination, but as revealed in our consciousness of worship of that Being. We conclude that the revealed religion of the Bible is that which is meant by the Constitution, and has been recognized by the Constitution, and has been recognized by the legislation of the General Assembly. On no other ground can blasphemy be criminal.

ARTICLE VI.

A LIFE THREAD.

It is an unending privilege of a Christian life that it is a willing fibre in those figures of earthly history which God is weaving for the tapestry of heaven. To study those plans and to see how each life, which, on earth, was willing to be hid with Christ in God, shall appear in them, must be among the satisfactions of heaven. And even here we may anticipate something of that enjoyment, by following such single threads and seeing how, as they wind in and out, the work of God appears.

So have we thought in looking over some memorials of a

missionary life, which has brought to view wonderful plans which have been developed during half a century, and which promise greater things to come.

In following the thread of the life of Mary Ann Clark Longley — afterwards Riggs, we find ourselves, first, in the little town of Hawley, Mass., in that hill country where the simple faith of the Puritans was still maintained when defection prevailed on the seaboard: The household of General Thomas Longley is an example of the community; its head is an educated farmer of moderate means, but honored in church and state. Sixth among the twelve children of this patriarchial household was the blue-eyed girl to whom was given the name of Mary Ann Clark. The time is November 10, 1813. It is the time when the New England churches were feeling the rising impulse of the new missionary movement. Still the impression of this childhood scene is rather that of the primitive than of the revived New England. But as the child, thus trained in pristine virtue, comes towards woman's estate, she is brought under the influence of the new impulses. The adjoining town of Buckland produced that wonderful woman, Mary Lyon. To her own gifts of mind and soul she has added both enthusiasm and culture from study, and especially from those other two remarkable minds, Rev. Joseph Emerson and Miss Z. P. Grant, who, with herself, seem to have been raised up for the purpose of planning and instituting a model of Christian education which was to prepare the women of America for the position in the history of salvation which had been assigned to them. In the development of this plan, Mount Holyoke Seminary was not as yet; but the zeal, out of which it grew, was in the soul of its future principal, as she taught winter schools at Buckland and Amherst in 1833 and 1834; and now, in the favored circle of young minds thus gathered close around that strong tense light appears the blue eyed girl. The eye, soft as it was, could not but gather steadfastness there, and the gentle face acquires lines of purpose, responsive to duty.

Hence our thread leads us to another scene, of which we know not whether to say, how like the last! or, how unlike! At Ipswich we find the same enthusiasms and devotions, the same studies, and, to a great extent, the same methods and ideas, but in place of the high womanhood of Miss Lyon we find presiding the Christian refinement of Miss Z. P. Grant. The contrast suggests a comparison. But the wonderful harmony with which two spirits so diverse wrought together under the inspiration of a common devotion, excludes the thought, and suggests, instead, the blessedness of that high sympathy in which all the good are made perfect in one. We must at least say, that if the strength learned from the one was a most necessary preparation for the duties and labors of a missionary life, the refinement of the other must have done much to perfect that Christian grace of manner and life which shine on through years of life among barbarians, and came out at the last as the central light of a refined Christian household. Now that the pupil is gone, the teacher remains to remember her as "a good scholar, a well balanced character, and a consistent Christian; as one of the valued helps to a teacher, by being in her right place at the right time, and doing the right things in the right way."

As this education was essentially a missionary one, it is not strange that we are next led into the interior of the continent, and find that the former child and pupil has, at the suggestion and selection of Miss Grant, become herself a teacher of duty as well as of knowledge for a year and a half at Bethlehem, in Indiana. Here came the call to a missionary life in the interior wilderness, and she returned to her home in Massachusetts and there, on February 16, 1837, was united in marriage to Rev. S. R. Riggs, then under appointment as a missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. to the Sioux or Dakota Indians.

After two months' waiting for the season for ascending the Mississippi, they left Cincinnati May 1, 1837, and using all diligence succeeded in reaching Fort Snelling on the

first of June. The summer is spent at the neighboring station of Lake Harriet, and on the last days of August they embarked on a "Mackinac boat" to ascend the Minnesota river. On the sixth day they reach Traverse des Sioux, and take up their line of march over the immense prairie. The train is not a railroad train. First came two one-ox carts, then "Dr. Williamson's wagon, so fully packed as to have but a single little corner" for the lady. "Mr. Riggs, walking beside the horses, and the doctor sometimes before and then behind, pursuing their way over hill and plain, between lakes and through marshes and streams of mud," day after day until the journey was accomplished, in thirteen days from Fort Snelling, eleven days of travel and two Sabbaths of rest.

They are now at their new home by the Lacquiparle, the lake-that-talks.' "Lake of Echoes," the gentle lady calls it. How different from the echoing brooks of the native hills! Yet here she is cheered by hearing the Lord's song in the strange land and in strange tongues. They soon found that these dark places were full of the habitations of cruelty. Yet, in some respects, the first five years at Lacquiparle were the most cheering of their life on heathen ground. They were in a measure beyond the opposition of Romanism and the pestilent border line between civilization and barbarism. Mr. Renville, the trader and chief, was the friend and patron of the mission. And in a few years they had gathered a little church in the wilderness, and were able to give thanks for more evidences of success, especially among the female portion of their charge, than had ordinarily fallen to the lot of laborers either in the heathen or the home field.

From this little garden, reclaimed from the desert, they came away in 1842, to spend a year among the scenes of childhood. Many and happy greetings met them, and they returned to their field refreshed in spirit, but not knowing what things should befall them there. They returned not alone. While they have been laboring, a brother has

passed from boyhood into a vigorous and generous young manhood; and he is with them as they begin to build a new mission house at Traverse des Sioux. Leaving husband and brother at that work, the lady goes on the long way to Lacquiparle under native escort. As they drew near the station, Indian friends came to meet them, but suddenly those friends are attacked, and two of them are murdered by a lurking party of their old foes, the Ojibwas. At the alarm, the Sioux came swarming from their village, but the enemy has gone, and they vent their blind fury by shooting one of the horses of the missionaries. Thus the tender woman is compelled to make the last four miles on foot, carrying her little child. Returning to Traverse des Sioux, there was one sweet Sabbath of thankful rest, spent with husband, brother, and reunited family, in a tent, anticipating that the next Sabbath they would be together in their completed house. And so they were; but of the brother only the form lay "upon the chest and box which were sent from home," the curls of his hair dripping with the water of the dark river in which he sank the day before. As the sun went down they smoothed his bed near by their dwelling in that "garden of roses," which himself had named but a few days before.

Through such a baptism they entered upon a life of new troubles.

During three years of labor at Traverse des Sioux, the sacred sadness resting over that garden balanced the outer trials incident to a life of missionary labor just upon the line where the most corruptible barbarism is met by the most corrupting scum of civilization. Even that cruelty and degradation began to feel the influence of Christian grace and love, so that it was with a double pang that the tender heart was transplanted again to the old home at Lacquiparle, in September, 1846.

They are again in the little room where they had come years before. But sad memories have displaced the beaming hopes of the bride of nine years since, and she has

found even a sadder weariness than that of the mother who brought her babe in there three years ago. Yet behind it all we read the "Even so, Father." And yet we can not but weep with her, as, writing to her own mother in the sweet New England home, she quotes the lines :

"Give me my own seat, Mother,
With my head upon thy knee ;
I've passed through many a changing scene,
Since thus I sat by thee.

"Oh ! let me look into thine eyes ;
Their meek, soft, loving light
Falls like a gleam of holiness,
Upon my heart to-night."

Lacquiparle was no longer what it had been. Joseph Renville had died a few months before their return. The moral miasma of the border was there. But still the missionary labored on in faith and love, and not without fruits. And the missionary wife, worn with labor and trial, and the cares of an increasing family, still kept the Christian home as a centre of blessings in the community, and cherished there the young souls who had been committed to her charge.

In 1851 they return again to the States — one of those returns whose blended sadness and gladness ripen human souls so fast. Thence back to Lacquiparle, where fire consumed their house in 1854, and they removed to Hazlewood, where their new home became the centre of a settlement of Christian Indians, a little nucleus of good influences in the midst of savage barbarity corrupted by civilized vice.

Here on the Sabbath, August 17, 1862, they enjoyed a communion season with their little flock in the wilderness. Early the next morning came word of the sudden outbreak of the Indian war, which filled all the broad belt of country between them and civilization with fire and blood. Their Indian friends were true, and ready to give them all the

help in their power. But what were they able to do? Only to help them flee. At one in the morning of August 19, they left their home for a hiding place on an island in the river, and on the next day commenced their perilous progress across the prairie. Forty-one persons, three fourths of them women and children, with only means of conveyance for a few of the feeblest, moved slowly for seven days over a hundred miles of open country, which was infested by a merciless foe, and were so guided and guarded that not a hair of their heads was harmed.

Yet such scenes can not be passed through without a shock; and we can not be surprised to find her, who had known so many trials, laid upon a bed of perilous illness in her new home in St. Anthony, Minn. Recovering in a degree, she removed with her family to Beloit, Wis., in 1865. Here, while her husband still devoted himself to his missionary work, in translating the Scriptures and entering the door of usefulness opened by the wonderful work of grace among the Indians in prison, her light shone in her home and in the community with a still, clear purity, which threw its radiance not only around day — doing good, by day and forward — illustrating the light of life where they need no sun, for the Lamb is the light; but backward also, making all who saw her to feel that there had been, through all those years of missionary life, an influence of grace and truth going forth, making in the midst of heathenism that central sanctuary and hearthstone of salvation, the Christian home, and surrounding that home with blessed influences.

In March, 1869, she sank under an attack of pneumonia. During an illness of twelve days she rested on the arm of the Father, desiring to live for her children's sake, but accepting his will. Once she said, "I feel very delicious; the taking down of the tabernacle appears so beautiful." On her last Sabbath morning she said, "I think he will come for me to-day." And she said, again and again, "He strengthens me." On Monday morning, March 22, she

"breathed her last," as her husband writes, "quietly, peacefully, without a struggle — only the gasping out of life — she passed beyond our reach of vision. Yesterday she had said to me 'I have neglected the flowers.' What flowers? I asked. She replied, 'The immortals.' Dear good one! She has gone to the flower garden of God."

And the immortals, which were her care, will follow her, or are gone before. Of her own family, when she died, one son was a preacher of the gospel, another was teaching the freedmen in Mississippi, and a daughter was a missionary in China. As regards those other immortals, for whom her life was spent, when the books are opened, and we all shall shudder to think how we have neglected and have wronged them, it will be blessed to hear, among the multitude of all kindreds and nations, some of their voices bearing witness that there were some among the blue-eyed race who did not neglect them.

THE BOOK TABLE.

I.—THE VARIATION OF ANIMALS AND PLANTS UNDER DOMESTICATION.

By CHARLES DARWIN, F.R.S., etc. Authorized edition, with a preface, by Professor Asa Gray. 2 vols. Pp. 494 and 568. New York: Orange Judd & Co.

It is well understood that, aside from the author's theory of the origin of species, these volumes are exceedingly interesting and valuable as containing a great amount of information in respect to domesticated animals and plants. Mr. Darwin has been recognized for thirty years as a first-class scientific investigator. The public are much indebted to Messrs. Judd & Company for a cheap edition of this epitome, of which Professor Gray says: "It is a perfect treasury of facts relative to domesticated animals and some of the more important cultivated plants; of the principles which govern the production, improvement, and preservation of breeds and races; of the laws of inheritance."

No doubt, "practical men and amateurs" will find abundant information in the volumes used for reference. But in the way of steady light reading for a rainy day, they may be disappointed. It requires no little discipline of mind and perseverance to get through the thousand pages. Butler's Analogy is not more close and long-sustained in its reasoning than portions of this work, and of its predecessor, the book on the origin of species; and the argument, in many of its details, is very intricate. And this feature alone should "give us pause," if we are light-headed enough to embrace the Darwinian theory precipitately, or heavy-headed enough to reject it without thorough examination.

The hypothesis, too, is still so new, so different from all former phases of the development idea, that it hardly seems wise for any one to commit himself incontinently either for or against it, unless one can show that Divine Revelation teaches just *how* God created animals and plants. The subject opens new lines of investigation that need to be followed long and far, and discussed long and well; and a final conclusion can only be reached then by the gravitation of all educated minds to a common result. Happily, while the theory gains ground in Europe and this country, there are some leading men of science who stand up against it, and so it will be thoroughly overhauled, from time to time.

For our ourselves, there are a few arguments of great force against the Darwinian view, although there are many arguments for it that still demand a real answer. The first two are from Agassiz, namely, that it is incredible that even so small and subordinate a thing as a fish-scale or a tooth should retain a special microscopic structure through all the succes-

sion of animals since life began, if animal structure is so fluid, so variable, as Darwin's theory supposes. Next, and still more, it is incredible, on the score of mere natural selection, that the few general and *ideal* plans on which all animals have been patterned from the first, should be so constant, while the manifold execution of these plans—the animals themselves, flesh and bone—have been so cloud-like in changeableness. The other argument is from a foreign Quarterly; it is that the lowest human races—or, on Darwin's view, even some anthropoid ancestors—should have been provided with a brain and a hand far in advance of that actual advantage in the struggle of life, which the theory makes necessary; for the men of the "Stone Age," (or Adam, as we should say,) had the same brain and hand as we, and had small occasion for so wonderful corporeal instruments, equal to all the uses of civilization. These considerations will do to anchor by. Not so with many brought forward in religious newspapers, in reviews, and even by Agassiz and Dana, in our opinion. Indeed, the most of the data in point given by these distinguished men, seem to tell in a direction opposite to the one intended, or can be readily harmonized with the view combated.

II.—STUDIES IN BIBLE LANDS. By Rev. W. L. GAGE. With seventy-two illustrations. American Tract Society, Boston. Western Agency, Rev. G. S. F. Savage, 84 Washington street, Chicago. 12mo. Pp. 236.

A book every way attractive. Tinted paper, clear type, seventy-two illustrations, twelve small maps and plans, a brisk style, a thoughtful tone, and a graphic and unusually careful comparison of the geography with the history of the Bible, constitute an unusual combination of the sources of interest. Mr. Gage did well to write and the Tract Society to print. We congratulate the Society on its continued enterprise.

The book is good enough to abide some friendly criticisms. It is naturally stronger on the geographical than the exegetical side, and a thorough and friendly Biblical scholar could have suggested some improvements. Sweeping over so large a compass of Jewish history, some hasty judgments were to be expected. And they are found here. The temptations in such a volume is, also, to speak too positively and definitely, sometimes precipitately. We should often use "perhaps," or, at the most, "probably," where Mr. Gage uses "doubtless." We call attention to these things—and we could mention many specimens,—because the *strictest* truthfulness of Biblical history should not be forgotten. Many of the geographical results will be questioned by competent men; but that, perhaps, is inevitable.

But there is one thing which we regret to see in such a volume. We refer to the theory of Eden and its rivers. It makes Eden to comprise indefinitely "all that the Egyptian scholars knew that was fair and promising," and thus "all that a Hebrew writer learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, would regard as fair, promising, and romantic." The river Eden was the fabled ocean river of the Greeks (!) and the four streams it

fed were the "Nile, Euphrates, Tigris and Indus." Now we are prepared to show that this theory breaks down at every step; while its bearing on the historic character of the Bible ought not to have escaped the notice of Mr. Gage. The discussion is unnecessary to the book, and ought not to have found its way there. With these minor qualifications we heartily commend the book.

III.—A CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, HOMILITICAL COMMENTARY. (Lange's.)
Containing the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. 8vo. Pp.
595. New York: C. Scribner & Co.

This volume belongs to the better portion of Lange's Commentaries. Dr. Otto Zöckler, the German author, is a scholarly, clear, and systematic expositor, and gives, in brief form, more of the history of exposition than his co-laborers. He is sober, and mainly evangelical; and so far as otherwise, he has fallen in the orthodox hands of Pres. Aiken, Professor Lewis, and Professor Green. This volume gives more of interpretation and less of sermonizing than many of the others, and is more homogeneous in character. Professor Green's editing of Solomon's Song is excellent. Familiar himself with the exposition of the Old Testament, he contents himself with correcting and wisely supplementing his author, adopting, with modifications, his view that the book is typical, and not allegorical. The only pedantry we notice is in the constant citing of the early English versions, including Wycliffe even, which was not a translation from the Hebrew, but from the Vulgate. Professor Aiken, in editing Proverbs, contents himself mainly with critical and grammatical remarks on words, phrases and constructions, of very considerable value. Professor Lewis' editing does not, in our judgment, add much to the value of Zöckler's Ecclesiastes. He shows how an excellent and thoughtful classical scholar may fail in the requisites for an interpreter of the Hebrew Scriptures. His disquisitions, though learned, are often diffuse and wide of the mark—here as in Genesis. His excursus on the "Olamie words," and his attempted correction of Zöckler on ch. xi. 9, 10, and others, we believe to be wrong. But his spirit is always excellent. On the whole, this volume meets a decided want, and meets it well.

IV.—THE LIFE OF JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, D. D. By HENRY CAR-
RINGTON ALEXANDER. 2 vols. 12mo. Pp. 480 and 921. New York: C.
Scribner & Co.

Professor Joseph Addison Alexander was a remarkable man. As a linguist he read, wrote and spoke well some seven languages, and knew (some of them thoroughly) about twenty more; twice as many as were needful to any but a comparative philologist. As a professor and teacher he was fertile, indefatigable, and fascinating. He was a voracious reader, devouring every thing but natural science and German metaphysics. He

had a fine literary enthusiasm, was an able, prolific and various writer, and a prodigious worker. American scholarship has produced no commentary so learned as Alexander's *Isaiah* (unabridged), and his *Mark* is one of the very best popular expositions of that gospel. He was a noble preacher too. With all his other qualities he combined humor, whimsicality, and grim impatience enough to make a spicy character. This biography has been prepared with much labor, and contains reminiscences from more than eighty persons. Its chief fault is excessive laudation. Princeton is the writer's heavens, and Addison Alexander is his sun. He not only exhausts all ordinary forms of panegyric, but wearies by constant comparison with all the great names in history. Not only is the "Napoleonic" look thrust perpetually upon us, but Dr. A. is ruddy like David, fails at first like Demosthenes and Webster—while Kirke White, Pope, Chatterton, Scott, Byron, Swift, De Quincey, Whitefield, Sophocles, Homer, Count Cavour, Alfred, and the like, figure as satellites. The book, however, is very interesting and profitable reading. We recommend it to the perusal of young ministers and theological students, in the earnest hope that they may catch some of Dr. Alexander's Biblical and literary enthusiasm.

V.—THE FIRST SIX BOOKS OF HOMER'S *ILIAD*. With explanatory notes
By JAMES R. BOISE, Professor of Greek in the University of Chicago.
Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.

The American press has poured out many annotated editions of the Grecian poet. President Felton's was a gem, of course, though his notes were too brief; Professor Owen's was excellent, for such a teacher would produce nothing less; while in Professor Anthon's *ως ἀστ*, the editor was as garrulous as Thersites. The time had fully come when American scholarship ought to produce an edition of more value to the student and for the classroom. We do not hesitate to accept the volume Professor Boise has just given us as a discharge from that obligation. Though we might occasionally follow the German less scrupulously in punctuation and in accentuation, though we would change the English orthography of some proper names, even though our post-juvenile vision suggests a somewhat bolder type, we heartily commend the volume to teachers and to students. The notes, and these are, after all, the characterizing portion of such a book, the notes in volumes of the classics, are often either mere nothings or promoters of laziness or slovenliness in translation, yet many have become fair Greek scholars in spite of the noxious things. The notes of Professor Boise delight us. They are terse, instructive, and suggestive, and point to some epic form, or subtle syntactical principle, or carry the student down into the depths, and among the treasures of philology.

The diligent use of this volume, notes and all, will not produce intellectual pulp, but mental muscle, tough, sinewy, and work-ful mental fibre.

The publishers, too, have done their work well, and have given us the classic "*Oceanus*" in a neat and beautiful form.

VI.—THE SUNSET LAND; Or, the Great Pacific Slope. By Rev. JOHN TODD, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. Pp. 352.

A very readable and entertaining volume Dr. Todd has made. His writing is as limber and shrewd as in our boyhood, and terser. It is good to see these veterans retaining their sprightliness. It makes younger men hopeful! On the thread of his journey he strings California, its mining and miners, soil and gigantic products, big trees, geysers, and Yo Semite Valley, Utah and Polygamy, the Chinese-American Question, and the Future of the Pacific Slope. Quite an inviting little book, and packed with well-culled and grouped information. Both rhetoric and grammar, however, are at times strangely at fault, as sharp eyes will have no difficulty in discovering on pp. 74, 83, 162, 166, 186, 226, 229, 230, 242, 302, 306. The author misquotes, as editors and politicians do every day, Berkeley's famous line, "Westward the *course* of empire takes its way." His solution of the Chinese-American question is this: "God has pity for other portions of his great family, and is bringing here, by thousands, and most likely by millions, that race who must be, from their past, life long minors, intrusted to our care, making us responsible for their receiving kind treatment, careful training, and, above all, the Gospel of His mercy." He puts on record the following instructive fact: In the building of the Central Pacific Railroad, "eight thousand Chinamen—and better workmen could not have been found—were put to work. Among all these there were no murders, no vigilance committees needed, no riots, no whisky shops, and no drunkenness."

VII.—THE SPIRIT OF LIFE; Or, Scripture Testimony of the Divine Person and Work of the Holy Ghost. By E. H. BICKERSTETH, M. A., author of "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever." New York: R. Carter & Brothers. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 12mo. pp. 192.

We have been sometimes asked for a good and full treatise on the Holy Spirit. This volume meets that inquiry. While it may press some doubtful texts into its service, especially from the Old Testament, and it may push others too far, it also offers a mass of evidence that cannot be gainsayed, carefully digested, and ably handled. Few readers will rise from the perusal without a deeper, clearer conviction of the strength of the case than they had before. We commend it to students of theology and to Christians generally. And we particularly commend it to the preacher who lately amazed his hearers with the statement contradicted by the very chapter containing his text, that the Holy Spirit was only Christ come again without his body, which had before prevented his omnipresence (although in the same breath he remarked that Christ took his body to heaven); also, that it was God in his essential nature coming to the soul; that the Scriptures are "divinely inspired" and *every man must be "divinely inspired" who properly understands them*; and other things of similar drift and significance. This book is well calculated to clear up such muddles—except when they are deliberate and willful.

VIII.—THE OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY, FROM THE CREATION TO THE RETURN OF THE JEWS FROM CAPTIVITY. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. With maps and wood-cuts. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo, pp. 714.

One of the series of Smith's Students' Histories. The present volume is an attempt to treat the Old Testament history in a brief form, and in accordance with the recent progress in Biblical studies. In connection with the narrative, it deals copiously and carefully with geographical and archaeological matters, and contains much that is found in "introductions" to the Old Testament. Many of its notes and illustrations are taken directly from Smith's Dictionary of the Bible. This history is written from a very full knowledge of the sources of information, is conservative and reverent, and contains a good deal of sound interpretation. Without becoming responsible for all its positions, we regard it as an excellent book to give an intelligent and coherent view of a region of history which lies very confusedly in many minds, young and old. For the purpose contemplated in the volume, we know no better work, if so good.

IX.—EVERY-DAY SUBJECTS IN SUNDAY SERMONS. By. R. L. COLLIER, (Chicago.) Boston American Unitarian Association. Chicago: Western News Company. Pp. 232.

The general public seldom hears from the American Unitarian Association. It is supposed by some to be quietly engaged in reproducing the writings of Dr. Channing. What has it come to that its imprint should cover such utterances as these?

"Berthold Auerbach, the divinely inspired man of this century."

"What inspiration put in (Titian) he faithfully put upon canvass."

"Mark and John knew Jesus no better than he."

"Love of the truth was the inspiration and miracle-working power in the life of our Master."

"It is the very essence of Calvinism to maintain that God himself has shut up his kingdom against many, if not most, of his own children. Every Calvinistic church in the land stands a monument to this theory of religion."

"The outward Church is becoming more and more an abstraction."

"The most heinous contradiction in morals—that one can give one's life in expiation of another's guilt."

"It is a religious delight to give the soul up to the miracle-working power of such a voice as Caboul's," (a Paris actor.)

"Mr. Jefferson's *Rip Van Winkle* has more religious power in it than most of the common-place average sermons of the day."

"The old story that God cursed the land cannot be true."

"It is no virtue in any man to be consistent."

"The universal silence of the educated Christian pulpit upon this matter"—future punishments.

Within its small compass the book succeeds well—for so slight an affair—in contradicting considerable truth, and in asserting erroneous and foolish things. What it says on “the folly of converting the Jews,” is, perhaps, meant to correct Paul, who held “the receiving of them” a feat of God’s great wisdom. The discourse proceeds on the assumption that, if converted to Christianity, they will, of course, become Trinitarians! the only significant thing about it.

X.—TAH-KOO WAH-KAN ; Or, the Gospel among the Dakotas. By S. R. Riggs, A. M., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., Boston Congregational Sunday School and Publication Society. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 18mo, pp. 490.

The record of thirty years’ self-denying Christian labor among the aborigines. Let those who would know how a modest but heroic missionary can toil on; and how a cultivated and lovely woman—the early companion of Miss Lyon and pupil of Miss Grant—could cheerfully endure; and how, under every interference and discouragement the Gospel could take hold, read this book. Would that all our veteran missionaries would record their experience—and that the churches would read. Mrs. Riggs is the subject of our article, “A Life Thread.” But so brief a sketch cannot do full justice to the subject. The book should be read. We trust it will be.

XI.—THE EARLIER YEARS OF OUR LORD’S LIFE ON EARTH. By Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 12mo, pp. 400.

Dr. Hanna’s Life of Christ, of which this is the first volume, will not be superseded by any or all of the numerous works now before the public. It has rare merits. Scholarly without a tinge of pedantry, deeply thoughtful yet perfectly clear, analytic and yet vivacious; felicitous in its descriptions both of nature and of men, it yet subordinates every thing to the presentation of the one great central Personage. It is thoroughly devout; and the style is of that English type—so seldom attained on this side of the water—which exactly coins its thought, having neither looseness, debility, nor bombast. The later volumes perhaps contain more striking materials; but the series belongs among the choice books for the family.

XII.—DISCOURSES ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. By the Reverend FATHER HYACINTHE, late Superior of the Barefooted Carmelites of Paris, and preacher of the Conferences of Notre Dame. Translated by LEONARD WOOLSEY BACON, Pastor of a Church of Christ, in Brooklyn, New York. With a Biographical Sketch. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. London: S. Low, Sons, Morston. 1867.

The independent attitude which Pere Hyacinthe has taken towards the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, of which he is a member and priest, and the judgment consequently pronounced against him, have

brought the man into sudden distinction before the whole Christian world. His recent brief visit to this country has greatly increased the popular interest and curiosity concerning him and his words and acts. The little book before us was hurried through the press, evidently to catch the tide of this popular sentiment at the flood. It will prove a success so far as gaining a wide circulation and bringing handsome returns of profit to compiler and publisher are concerned. But most thoughtful readers will lay it down with a feeling of disappointment. It is too fragmentary—too incomplete. It gives us some idea of the man and of his way of presenting truth, and so engages interest and stimulates curiosity. But we are unsatisfied because the subjects treated are of vital importance and we want the presentation of the full discussion, instead of the specimen bricks, which are all we get. A few weeks' delay would have enabled the translator to furnish a volume, worthy of careful study and fraught with weighty influence for good. The public curiosity would have waited patiently for that. Now that curiosity has just lost its edge, without being satisfied. When the promised additions come, we apprehend the demand for them will be comparatively limited.

XIII.—THE ARMY RE-UNION : SOCIETIES OF THE ARMIES OF THE CUMBERLAND, THE TENNESSEE, THE OHIO, AND GEORGIA. Chicago : Griggs & Co. Pp. 339.

The interest of this sumptuous volume will not be confined to surviving members of the great Army Divisions. In perfection of typography, (from the press of Church, Goodman and Donnelley) it surpasses all else the West has yet done. The paper, heavy, firm, and delicately tinted ; the type, clearly and handsomely cut ; and the fine lithographs of Army badges, in gold and colors—all done in Chicago—prove that our book-making epoch has fairly arrived. Better work the best Eastern houses cannot show. The steel-plate portraits of Generals alone are of Eastern production. They are handsome medallions, worthy a place in this model Western volume,—which is enough to say for them ! The taste in the arrangement of the book, and the even beauty of its typography deserve special honor. There is exquisite literary skill in the introductions and general arrangement of the material ; and it is the crowning merit of the publishers, that their own house furnished the ability to gather what was noble and fitting therefor, in the person of General A. C. McClurg, and to give it such artistic and finished form in the person of Rev. E. C. Towne. If the Messrs. Griggs propose to outdo this piece of work at any time, they must do something elegant indeed.

XIV.—A GERMAN COURSE ; for Colleges, Etc. By Prof. G. H. COMFORT, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. New York : Harpers. 1870. Pp. 498.

This text-book maker has discovered that in learning spoken languages, one does not learn all of anything at one time. Accordingly his first part, 160 pages, contains practical lessons for learning to read, write, and speak

German, beginning at the points of contact between English and German, and meeting alike the learner's want of a vocabulary, simpler grammatical forms, laws of syntax, idioms, and pronunciation. As much as possible the student is led by analysis and independent investigation to discover what he learns without resorting to vocabulary or forms. The second part, 40 pages, contains conversations, synonyms, letters and business forms, and introductory reading lessons. Part third, 194 pages, is a thoroughly wrought grammar, with introductions upon the history, characteristics, and dialects of the German language. Part fourth, 80 pages, the vocabularies. The printing is superb, and by its management of italic and full-face type a real help to study. Such a manual must prove a great comfort to any one learning the German!

XV.—SERMONS OF HENRY WARD BEECHER. Reports from "Plymouth Pulpit." March—September, 1869. New York. J. B. Ford & Co. Pp. 466.

Rhetorically, Mr. Beecher's sermons always deserve attention. There may be less or more truth in them, good teaching or poor teaching. When his publishers style him, in an advertisement, "the greatest living religious teacher," the intelligent public will take it *cum grano*. After so much listening to him for years, there ought to be a vaster increase of instruction achieved. No one ever more repeated himself, save Theodore Parker. No accepted teacher oftener contradicts himself. But for putting ever varied aspects upon his thoughts, for rhetorical *costume*, he is worth studying. The world's ear is open to exhaustlessly fertile changes of expression. Also for moral and spiritual observation. Men like to have themselves and their neighbors painted Sundays, even if they have no idea of amending, indeed rather the more for that. Mr. Beecher's homiletical successes also show how this generation appetizes a pulpit style as near as possible to magazine writing and lecturing.

XVI.—THE PRIMEVAL WORLD OF HEBREW TRADITION. By FREDERIC HENRY HEDGE. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1870. Pp. 283.

The Messrs. Roberts Brothers, of the Hub, are among our most enterprising publishers, discovering a rare tact in suiting the most subtle wants of their readers. In no book of theirs does this trait appear so remarkably as in Dr. Hedge's Primeval World. Knowing that the most intelligent readers will feel inclined to question a great many passages in the book, they have left a very wide margin, duly separated by a perpendicular line from the text, for the insertion of interrogation points. Many will also feel that the book is weak: the publishers, therefore, have provided this open space, half as wide as the text, for the insertion of ideas so as to make the book more valuable.

Dr. Hedge's writings always afford pleasant reading; and there is much that is suggestive. This book, however, does not seem to be in his best

vein. With our memories of some of the author's former sermons, we are a little disappointed that these twelve discourses upon the Creation, Our First Parents, Patriarchal Longevity, The Flood, Abraham and Isaac, are not of better quality. These fine themes should be handled with more power, if they are to be exhibited in printed sermons. We cannot tell a busy man to buy or read this book. With all the Doctor's scholarship we are somewhat surprised that he so runs in the ruts of his creed as to be often unacquainted with what his orthodox neighbors hold to be true.

XVII.—SONGS FOR THE SANCTUARY: Or, Hymns and Tunes for Christian Worship. A. S. Barnes & Co., New York and Chicago. 1867. Pp. 456.

This collection embraces 1,342 hymns, 21 doxologies, 55 selections for chanting, and nearly 360 tunes. The selection is judiciously made, so as to present things new and old in choice variety and due proportion. The quality of both the words and the music is, almost without exception, excellent, and in their mutual adaptation well suited to aid the faith and devotion of Christian souls. After five years' experience with it in a daily college service and family service, we heartily commend it as a book which wears *well*.

XVIII.—LIGHT AND TRUTH; Or, Bible Thoughts and Themes. The Acts and the Larger Epistles. By H. BONAR, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, Chicago: W. G. Holmes. 12mo. Pp. 409.

A series of eighty-three thoughtful papers on an equal number of passages of the New Testament. They bear the aspect of sermons, condensed into one quarter of their original length. They are marked by terse and pointed thought, as well as the sound views and devout feeling which are characteristics of their author. In this age of religious pap, we rejoice to know both that there are such writers as Bonar, and that they can find readers.

XIX.—OLD AND NEW. Published monthly. Boston: H. O. Houghton & Co. Nos. 1 and 2, January and February. 1870.

The Christian Examiner, which for over forty years has held a high place for literary merit, and been an advocate of Unitarian Theology, has died; and its spirit has transmigrated to this new monthly, which, though no name appears on the title page, is understood to be edited by Rev. E. E. Hale.

This magazine is started on a broad plan. It professes to offer articles to interest children, as well as instruct the old; to have stories to amuse, and essays, learned, philosophical, religious. Besides the "Examiner," for book notices, it has a Round Table under the title of "Record of Progress."

It proposes to "explain religious subjects frankly and boldly;" and this

means, so far as we can judge by the leading articles already published (by Dr. Freeman Clarke, on the Perfection of Jesus, and by Dr. Bellows, on Inspiration), to advocate Unitarianism, and views which from an orthodox standpoint seem rationalistic, while probably avoiding the extreme doctrines of the Parker school.

XX—CHURCH WORK. 16mo. pp. 64. Boston: Congregational Sabbath School and Publishing Society.

A very practical manual, prepared by Rev. D. P. Noyes, the efficient Secretary for Home Evangelization in Massachusetts; to aid churches in the endeavor to develop their working-power.

It points out very fully, though in a brief space, the forms of Church work, and suggests the best methods for successful action. Giving as it does the results of wide observation and experience, its general circulation in our churches would certainly be productive of good. Wise suggestions are found on every page.

XXI.—JESUS ON THE THRONE OF HIS FATHER DAVID; Or, the Tabernacle of David: When will it be Built Again? A sequel to "The Promise of Shiloh." By JOSEPH L. LORD, M. A., of the Boston Bar. New York: James Inglis & Co., 26 Cooper Institute. 1869. For sale by A. Williams & Co., Boston. Pp. 92.

Mr. Lord's Essays are of better quality than most of the Second Advent writings; and they are published in very attractive style.

XXII.—THE ROYAL ROAD TO FORTUNE. By Emily Huntington Miller. Chicago: Alfred L. Sewell & Co. 1870. 8vo. Pp. 333.

This is the first of a series, which will compose the **LITTLE CORPORAL LIBRARY**. If the subsequent volumes shall equal this in merit, the series will be peculiarly attractive to the boys, and, like all of Mr. Sewell's publications, healthful in its moral influence. Mrs. Miller has a rare tact in writing for young people.

XXIII.—REMOVING MOUNTAINS; OR, LIFE LESSONS FROM THE GOSPELS. By John S. Hart, L.L. D. Robert Carter & Bros., 550 Broadway, New York. Chicago: W. G. Holmes, 148 Lake Street. 1870. 12mo. Pp. 306.

This is a thoughtful, suggestive book, by a clear-headed, warm-hearted, Christian layman. The Life Labors which he deduces from the Gospels are rich and instructive. They cannot fail to be read with profit by ministers or laymen.

THE ROUND TABLE.

A GENERAL MOVEMENT WESTWARD.—It is beginning to dawn upon the Congregational mind and conscience this side of "Byram River," that the relations of the churches east and west of that stream to our great benevolent enterprises are changing fast, and that a change is to follow in the relative duties of these churches and those. In respect to two leading Societies, the discovery is spreading that New England cannot longer carry the "biggest end of the load;" the next discovery will be that ALL our National Christian Societies must make a movement Westward. What is true of Home and Foreign Missions, will soon be just as true of other departments of our work for Christ.

It was eminently fortunate for us, that, when an affiliated denomination left the A. H. M. S. on our hands, the New England States—and especially Massachusetts and Connecticut—were able to pour into the treasury at New York a surplus of their collections, which kept the work from dwindling. The American Board may, ere long, pass through the same change of constituency. But, when Presbyterians and others leave the Board in Congregational hands—taking up other organizations of their own—it is not likely that the Congregational churches of those noble old States can keep up the annual foreign missionary collections to even the present figures, much more supply the increase which the increasing work in foreign lands demands.

There is not a single State, out of New England, which ought not to have in view an advance in Home Missionary contributions up to and beyond the point of supporting all the feeble churches of the State. There is not one in which some sort of organization, State-wise—perhaps, after the fashion of Maine—would not be a great advantage and blessing. Each State should look after its own destitute and dependent churches, drawing from the National treasury at New York what may be needful for a term of years; and, after that, paying over to that treasury the surplus of its collections for this cause. The older churches, of what they call Down East "the nearer West," though they may not grow in number and in membership as do those of the newer States and Territories, grow in wealth faster; and they can make, and therefore ought to make, a great advance in their gifts for "the regions beyond." There is more than one State east of the Mississippi that might, in a very few years, be the peer of Massachusetts and Connecticut in Home Missionary givings. California seems likely to become so first, perhaps because it produces the material of money. But there is no reason why California should give \$97.55 for each of her home missionaries, and Illinois, so much her elder and so strong in her churches, give but \$58.07 for each of hers. There is no reason why Illinois should

contribute but one-sixth of what is expended within her limits for Home Missions. There is no reason why two or three thousand dollars should be the whole annual sum given by States like Wisconsin and Iowa.

The great Central States cannot all be brought up to "pull upon an even whiffle-tree" with the great Eastern ones simultaneously. But they can all come up in time, *one after another*. In the church-building work, those whose ample and handsome houses of worship are already built, and have been for years past, can help those in which a great work of church-erection is going on, and must be going on for years to come. The Congregational Union has helped to build but 12 churches in Massachusetts, and 2 in Connecticut, against 37 in Michigan, 43 in Wisconsin, 59 in Iowa, and 62 in Illinois. In the next sixteen years, some of our Mountain Territories will need aid for 30 to 60 churches, instead of some of the four States last named, and these are under solemn obligation to take the place of benefactors to new States farther west which others have held to them. Our great publishing work, as a body of Christians, is going to assume new importance when its various departments are affiliated and simplified, and the distracting appeals to the churches cease; and the debt the "nearer West" owes for the healing leaves of a Christian and Puritan literature to the East, the Master will expect to have paid to the "farther West" in kind. The more Congregational and freer Congregationalism, that is growing so powerful around the Lakes and in the Mississippi Valley, has been planted and ripened from Eastern seed, and in goodly proportion must do the work of seeding the plains and the mountain slopes with the truth in which our strength and our future lie.

Manifestly, until our ministers and churches *feel* that they are now called of God to this advance movement along the whole line of Congregational benevolence, the present disproportion between the means of our older and stronger churches and their gifts, compared with those of New England, will exist. And, manifestly, on the fields where this advance can be made (and must be, or we shall fall far behind our work and responsibility,) the call of God will not be heard and felt, unless the SOCIETIES THEMSELVES *move out upon these fields with more telling appeals and a more vigorous canvass for contributions*. The machinery that brings golden returns must be worked as widely and as powerfully in some portions of what used to be called the West as it has been in New England. That which interests Christians and churches in these grand and indispensable benevolent movements, must be brought home as freely and constantly and closely here as there. With less of systematic home training in charity than the East has enjoyed, our churches need more outside appliances to stir them up and keep them giving, than the churches of the East. They have less. The American Board, for example, through its resident officials, its anniversaries, and its fresh and recent information from foreign lands, always has been a near and living thing within a certain distance from the Atlantic, and a remote and rather unreal thing farther away. It has held one anniversary on the shores of Lake Michigan. It has never held one on the upper Mississippi. The A. M. Association finds its account in going

Westward often, both in funds and missionaries. Boston and New York have absorbed, heretofore, each year, a good deal of intelligence and stimulus touching the prominent branches of our Congregational work—the newspaper reports of which have made comparatively slight impression elsewhere. It is high time that Western anniversaries for the same objects gave impulse such as more immediate contact alone can give to the older churches, at least this side of the Hudson. The Western College Society is opening its eyes, and, having had one anniversary at Marietta, in Ohio, is considering “the matter of holding the annual meeting of the Society at least once in three years at the West.” States in which that Society has made colleges strong are evidently called of God to aid States in which the Puritan College movement is still weak. “Freely ye have received, freely give.”

How, now, can this movement of the great National Societies Westward get on foot? No man can tell all the methods that will yet prove wise and successful; but a few hints suggest themselves. When the Board is sending missionaries across the continent to the Oriental world, the usual “farewell meeting” can as appropriately be held in Chicago as in Boston. The missionaries will take the Pacific railroad, instead of taking ship, as they used always to do. The great mass meetings of the Board—if it is to draw Western strength and vigor to it—may profitably be held 500 miles or more this side of the Atlantic, oftener than it has probably occurred to New England people to hold them. Whether Home Missionary State funds can wisely be collected into Western State treasuries, and commissions be issued elsewhere than at New York, may not be clear; but that energetic State organizations for promoting the raising of funds should be set on foot, is clear enough. That the American Board, also, should have more receiving agents here-a-way, is the conviction of some of its friends. That the College Society should find “fresh fields and pastures new” for its agencies, instead of sticking close to the Atlantic, is very plain. One of its Secretaries might well be posted in the “nearer West.” Our Publishing Society is requested by the Iowa General Association to hold a Chicago Anniversary next April, during the week of the Triennial Convention. Whether all the National Societies would not find it vastly to their profit to do the same as often as the Triennial Convention occurs, at least, reaching and stimulating their ministers and Christians in these Northwestern States as cannot otherwise be done, is worth considering. There are imperative reasons why the Congregational Union, whose church-building enterprise in our behalf is positively wronged by our churches, should hold such a meeting in Chicago next April. Why not the A. H. M. S., also? When this thing is fairly inaugurated, we shall all wonder that we suffered the lack and the loss of it so long.

IOWA COLLEGE.

G. F. M.

A CROWDED PORTFOLIO.—The editorial portfolio of the REVIEW is swelled to bulging. Our presses burst with new wine. We knew, before the transmigration of the magazine, that it would be so. The intellectual and moral activity of this portion of the Pilgrims' inheritance is as won-

derful as its industrial, commercial, social, and political life. We are in the region of experiment, enterprise and growth. We are in the heart of a great constituency. Four Congregational magazines were crowded together in the narrow precincts of New England, and it was high time that one of them at length should migrate a thousand miles to the center — time for a broader outlook and a fuller representation. Our contributors are scattered from Maine to California, and, if we realize our ideal, so will our readers be. We design a magazine for the whole country. To the goodly list of our contributors we can now add the names of Rev. Drs. Palmer, Laurie, Mahan, Ballard, J. B. Walker, R. Patterson, Beecher, Moor; Professors Emerson, J. B. L. Soule, L. F. Parker; Rev. Messrs. Lanphear, Mills, Cross, Goodenow; and Hon. E. P. Weston.

ONE OF THE ERRATA. — Some provoking errata occurred in our January number. One of them so utterly extinguished the sense of an important sentence in our "Salvation," that we reproduce and correct it: "Besides Theology . . . and General Literature, . . . we shall include Science, as it touches civilization on the one side and Christianity on the other; and (for 'and,' read Art,) especially those forms of Art that enter into Christian civilization," etc., etc.

We may add, that an arrangement with the printer to issue the present number with new type, was unavoidably defeated, but will be carried out in the next number.

READERS WANTED. — Paying subscribers are essential to the success of this magazine. But earnest, thoughtful readers are even more necessary to the accomplishment of its true aims. We shall try to make the matter of its pages readable and interesting. We cannot promise to make it all easy reading. We wish to furnish that which shall be worthy of thoughtful perusal. We desire no less to rally numbers in all our churches, to take up and read what is presented, with minds alive and awake. Do not pastors owe it to their flocks, with respect to both intellectual and spiritual elevation, to cultivate a more general taste for such reading? One pastor, appreciating these views, writes thus:

"Such a periodical would do excellent service, if it could be put into the hands of our Christian people, and get itself *read*. But how to make even our most intelligent Christians read and ponder such substantial stuff as will find place on its pages — that is the question. We are flooded with periodical literature, and the lightest floats on top. The good people get hold of that, and have no time for the heavier matter. The more reason why we should try to push such more solid and useful reading upon our people, and for the sake of that push the thinner and weaker aside."

As all must acknowledge the want, will not all act with energy for its relief, and use *THE REVIEW* as a helper to this end?

CONGREGATIONALISM IN BOSTON. — The Springfield Street Church, formed in the southern part of the city, in 1860, has voted to disband. The church edifice used by this society was built by a benevolent gentleman, with the best intentions, and generously offered for the use of the church; but, as he retained in his own hands the title to and control of the building, this peculiar state of things has always been a hindrance to its prosperity.

Recently, without even the knowledge of neighboring churches, the edifice was sold to Presbyterians; and the church, therefore, voted to disband. Consultation with others before the sale, would, it is believed, have led to a different result. Still, the loss may be greater in appearance than in reality, for the way is now open for starting a church in a better location, though in the same section of the city, and under auspices more

favorable for growth and permanence. This region is already being surveyed, with reference to such an enterprise.

Further south, in what was recently Roxbury, the Highland Church, organized in 1869, has sprung into a vigorous life. A church edifice, costing about \$25,000, will probably be erected the present year. The long struggle of the Springfield Street Church and the rapid growth of the Highland Church, strikingly illustrate the difference between dependence on a patron and that reliance on the energy and self-sacrifice of a united church which our system encourages.

S P R I N G .

When from the sullen North
The Frosts, with crackling tread,
And icy mail and spear, come marching forth,
By frowning Winter led ;

The Trees make bare their forms
To meet the coming foe ;
Naked Athletæ, wrestling with the Storms,
Buskined and plumed with snow.

But, when the strife is done,
And baffled tempests cease,
And the scarred limbs rest in the April sun,
As soldiers rest in peace ;

Spring, with her noiseless loom
And budding distaff, hastes
To weave new robes and clothe in tender bloom
The wide-spread battle-wastes.

And where the angry storm
Blew hoarse through leafless ways,
Deep-curtained birds, tuneful and multiform,
Now sing their bridal lays

So thou, my soul, prepare !
Strong wrestlers seek thy life ;
Stripping thy powers of every cumbrance bare,
Stand — ready for the strife !

And when thy foes have fled,
And when thy fears depart,
Fresh wreathes of joy shall spring upon thy head,
New songs within thy heart.

J. B. L. S.